

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

EDITED BY

PROFESSOR E. V. ARNOLD, Litt.D.

AND

F. W. HALL, M.A.

BOARD OF MANAGEMENT:

J. W. MACKAIL, M.A., LL.D., *Chairman.*

Prof. R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., *Hon. Treasurer.*

E. HARRISON, M.A., *Hon. Secretary.*

Prof. F. HAVERFIELD, LL.D.,
W. E. P. PANTIN, M.A.,

With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary representing the Council of the Classical Association.

H. P. RICHARDS, M.A.,
Representing the Oxford Philological Society.

Prof. W. RIDGEWAY, LL.D., Litt.D., Sc.D.,
Representing the Cambridge Philological Society.

With the co-operation of Prof. WM. GARDNER HALE, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO; Principal W. PETERSON, LL.D., C.M.G., MCGILL UNIVERSITY, MONTREAL; Prof. T. G. TUCKER, Litt.D., UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE; Prof. JOHN WILLIAMS WHITE, LL.D., Litt.D., HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

VOLUME VIII

PUBLISHED FOR THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION BY

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, LONDON, W.

AND

GINN & COMPANY, 29, BEACON STREET, BOSTON, MASS.

1914

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
710762
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R 1915 L

NEW YORK
PUBLIC
LIBRARY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

No. 1.

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Notes on the <i>Agamemnon</i> . A. S. F. GOW | I |
| Emendations in Plato's <i>Phaidros</i> . H. G. VILJOEN | 7 |
| On the Aristotelian use of <i>Λόγος</i> : A Reply. J. L. STOCKS | 9 |
| 'Αθηναίων Πολιτεία, XXX. 3-4. J. A. R. MUNRO | 13 |
| Note on Thucydides II. c. 48, § 3. W. RHYS ROBERTS | 16 |
| Notes on Dares and Dictys. R. T. CLARK | 17 |
| On some passages of Ovid's <i>Tristia</i> . S. G. OWEN | 21 |
| The Grammatical Chapters in Quintilian I. 4-8. F. H. COLSON | 33 |
| Salapantum disertum. H. W. GARROD | 48 |
| Etymologies and Derivations. EDWIN W. FAY | 50 |
| <i>Summaries of Periodicals :</i> | |
| Literature and General | 61 |
| Language | 71 |

No. 2.

| | |
|---|-----|
| Thucydidea (<i>continued</i>). H. RICHARDS | 73 |
| Theocritea. ARTHUR PLATT | 86 |
| Boethus of Sidon. J. F. DOBSON | 88 |
| XPH and ΔΕΙ. THOMAS D. GOODELL | 91 |
| A neglected Manuscript of the <i>Moretum</i> . A. SOUTER | 103 |
| Note on Thucydides VII. 28. 3. S. C. BOOKER | 104 |
| Notes on Lucan VIII. W. B. ANDERSON | 105 |
| On the chronology of the Fronto Correspondence. C. R. HAINES | 112 |
| Neaera as a Common Name. J. P. POSTGATE | 121 |
| The Caesura in Virgil, and its bearing on the authenticity of the Pseudo-Vergiliana. W. G. D. BUTCHER | 123 |
| Claudius and the <i>Primores Galliae</i> . H. J. CUNNINGHAM | 132 |
| <i>Summaries of Periodicals :</i> | |
| Literature and General | 134 |
| Language | 144 |

No. 3.

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Notes on Horace. CHARLES E. BENNETT | 145 |
| A Transposition in Propertius. A. E. HOUSMAN | 151 |
| The Text of the <i>Bellum Gallicum</i> and the work of H. Meusel. T. RICE HOLMES | 156 |
| The importance of the Veronese Palimpsest in the First Decade of Livy. CLARA M. KNIGHT | 166 |
| On the value of Modern Greek for the study of Ancient Greek. ALBERT THUMB | 181 |
| A false quotation from Plautus. F. W. HALL | 205 |
| Verse-Weight. E. HARRISON | 206 |
| Rainbow, Sky, and Stars in the <i>Iliad</i> and <i>Odyssey</i> : a Chorizontic Argument. G. H. MACURDY | 212 |
| <i>Summaries of Periodicals:</i> | |
| Literature and General | 216 |
| Language | 224 |

No. 4.

| | |
|---|-----|
| On certain Fragments of Pindar. E. B. CLAPP | 225 |
| Vindiciae Platonicae I. JOHN BURNET | 230 |
| On the Text of the <i>Stromateis</i> of Clement of Alexandria. J. P. POSTGATE | 237 |
| The <i>Codex Bambergensis</i> of the First Decade of Livy (I.-VII. 17) with illus- trations. A. H. KYD | 248 |
| In Memoriam—Alastair Hope Kyd. R.S.C. | 253 |
| Notes on Ovid's <i>Ibis</i> , <i>Ex Ponto Libri</i> , and <i>Halieutica</i> . S. G. OWEN | 254 |
| Notes on the <i>Naturales Quaestiones</i> of Seneca. H. W. GARROD | 272 |
| Claudius and the <i>Primores Galliae</i> : A Reply and a Restatement. E. G. HARDY | 282 |
| The Paean of Philodamos of Scarpheia. J. U. POWELL | 288 |
| <i>Summaries of Periodicals:</i> | |
| Literature and General | 289 |
| Language | 296 |
| INDICES TO VOL. VIII. | 297 |

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

JANUARY, 1914.

NOTES ON THE *AGAMEMNON*.

(Wecklein's numeration.)

259 sqq. (The chorus have narrated the events up to what immediately preceded the actual murder of Iphigeneia.)

τὰ δ' ἔνθεν οὐτ' εἶδον οὐτ' ἐννέπω.

260 τέχναι δὲ Κάλχαντος οὐκ ἄκραντοι.

Δίκα δὲ τοῖς μὲν παθοῦ-

σιν μαθεῖν ἐπιρρέπει.

τὸ μέλλον δ'

ἐπεὶ γένοιτ' ἂν κλύοις· προχαίρετω.

265 ἴσον δὲ τῷ προστένειν.

τορὸν γὰρ ἥξει σύνορθρον ἀνγαῖς.

πέλοιτο δ' οὖν τὰπὶ τούτοισιν εὐπρα-

ξίς.

263 δ' add. Elmsley, 264 ἐπεὶ γένοιτ' a f h, ἐπιγένοιτ' M., 266 σύνορθρον Wellauer, συνορθὸν M., ἀνγαῖς Hermann, ἀνταῖς M.

Ll. 263 and 264 have been much vexed, and a string of conjectures will be found in Wecklein's appendix. All of them¹ produce roughly the same meaning—'it is useless to enquire into the future, which (l. 265) is bound to be disastrous.'

My complaint against these readings is that the whole antistrophe yields with them no reasonable sense. It is not true that the future 'will dawn clear with the light of day,' and if we prefer to read *σύνορον ἄταις* (Ahrens) or the like, still no reasonable meaning can be attached to 267 sqq. 'The future is bound to be disastrous, but at any rate may prosperity be ours henceforward' is an absurd prayer, and 'the immediate future will be disastrous, but let us

¹ Except Margoliouth's ὁ μέλλον δ' ἐπεὶ γένηται κλέος, προχαίρετω· | ἴσον δὲ τὸν προστένειν, which he renders *qui gaudisurus est allato nuntio de excidio Troiae is iam nunc gaudeat*; *alium autem par est iam*

nunc lugere, veniet autem luce clarior. This also produces no reasonable sense from the whole passage.

hope that the remote future will be prosperous,' if this meaning can be tortured from the Greek, is not much better.

The landmarks in the sentence are, I think, two in number. One is that Agamemnon has to pay for his sin in sacrificing Iphigeneia (261 sq., cf. 228 sqq.),¹ and the other is that *τὰπὶ τούτοις* means 'from this point on,' and that the prayer is for the immediate beginning of a new and prosperous era. It follows, therefore, that the period which the chorus know to be certainly lamentable must be the ten years which have elapsed since the sacrifice of Iphigeneia, during which the flower of Argos has been dying at Troy (cf. 435 sqq.); and of this period, if Clytemnestra's preparations mean anything, they may reasonably expect to have information in the morning.

What is to be done with the Greek I do not know. L. 259 must, I think, refer not to the ten years in question, but only to the actual sacrifice at which the narrative has stopped short; l. 260 alludes, therefore, to Calchas's forebodings of that sacrifice (154 sqq.), not to his general prophecies as to the campaign (131 sqq.). In l. 263, if *τὸ μέλλον* meant 'what was then in store for them,' all would be well;² but the neighbouring tenses forbid. Therefore *τὸ μέλλον* is corrupt: *τὸ λοιπόν* would give the required sense after a fashion. In 264, whatever word should replace *τὸ μέλλον*, the subject of *γένοιτο* is *τὸ κλύειν*, and the meaning is: 'you will hear <what has happened since> all in good time: till then let it be.' The general sequence of thought in the antistrophe is: 'Agamemnon's sin must have brought in its train disasters, of which we shall hear soon enough; let us hope that they are now ended and fortune once more favourable.'

427. ὀμμάτων δ' ἐν ἀχηνίαις
ἔρρει πᾶς Ἀφροδίτα.

Cf. Ach. Tat. vi. 6, *μάλιστα γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς κάθηται τὸ κάλλος*, and see the whole passage. Eumathius iii. 7, *τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς κατεφίλησα καὶ ὅλον εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν ἀνιμυσάμην τὸν ἔρωτα· ὀφθαλμός γὰρ ἔρωτος πηγὴ*. Both suggest that the eyes are those of Helen not of Menelaus.

536 *τίεσθαι δ' ἀξιότατος βροτῶν*
τῶν νῦν· Πάρις γὰρ οὔτε συντελὴς πόλις
ἐξεύχεται τὸ δρᾶμα τοῦ πάθους πλέον.

'Agamemnon,' says the herald, 'is the most august of men—that is of men now alive, for Paris. . . .' Any unprejudiced person, asked to complete this sentence, would, I think, go on: 'who was formerly more worthy of honour, is now dead.' But that is not what Aeschylus says; on the contrary, he says

¹ I take it to be certain that 261, 2 embody the doctrine of instruction by suffering (cf. 187 with Headlam's note) and discount conjectures which

attach *τὸ μέλλον* to this sentence.

² If *τὸ μέλλον* is taken with *γένοιτο* alone, there is no subject for *προχαιρέτω*.

that Paris, so far from being *τίεσθαι ἄξιος*, was *ὀφλὼν ἀρπαγῆς τε καὶ κλοπῆς δίκην* and has deservedly paid the penalty for his crimes. I have translated *τῶν νῦν* with emphasis, because if it were not emphatic it would not be there at all. *Ἀξιότατος βροτῶν* is a simple superlative (like, for example, *Ch.* 301 *εὐκλεεστάτους βροτῶν*): *τῶν νῦν* an unexpected qualification of the superlative which demands an explanation.¹ Since the qualification is not explained, and must in any case be irrelevant to this context, I take *τῶν νῦν* to be corrupt.

If we consider further the relation between Agamemnon's honour and the punishment of Paris, it is obvious that the relation is temporal rather than causal. Agamemnon has only been the most august of men *since* Paris paid the penalty; so long as he remained unpunished Agamemnon's reputation has been under a cloud. Write, therefore, *τὸ νῦν* or *τανῦν* for *τῶν νῦν*. *Νῦν* does not occur elsewhere with the article in Aeschylus, but *τὸ πρῖν* appears more than once, *τὸ πρόσθε* in l. 1437 of this play, and *τὰ πρόσθε* in l. 19. The punctuation should be, I think,

. . . ἀξιότατος βροτῶν·
τανῦν Πάρις γὰρ κ.τ.λ.

831. 'By the vague *δοκοῦντας*, "certain ones in appearance," he conveys to them that he is quite aware of Clytemnestra's insincerity' (Headlam). Verrall (p. 220) also holds that Agamemnon suspects Clytemnestra, and these are the only two opinions on the subject I have been able to discover.

For the understanding of the *Agamemnon* as a whole it perhaps matters little whether Agamemnon knows what has been going on or not, but it makes a good deal of difference to our conception of this curious and ominous scene, and Aeschylus has, as it seems to me, been at pains to show that Agamemnon has no suspicions.

The chorus have said in effect (779 sqq.) 'appearances are deceptive and sympathy is often feigned, but to a discerning man the eyes betray those whose sympathy is hypocritical. My congratulations are sincere, but time will show who has been faithful, who unfaithful, in your absence.' To this Agamemnon presently replies (821 sqq.): 'I entirely agree with you,

παύροις γὰρ ἀνδρῶν ἐστὶ συγγενὲς τόδε,
φίλον τὸν εὐτυχοῦντ' ἀνευ φθόνου σέβειν.

I know from my own experience how empty appearances of friendship are, for of all those who came to Troy with me Odysseus alone was whole-heartedly loyal. For the rest, political and religious questions shall be discussed in the assembly, and we will take measures to correct anything amiss.'

¹ The emphasis is due not to the metrical position of the words *τῶν νῦν* (Headlam, *On Editing Ae.*, pp. 5 sqq.) but to the order. According to Kühner-Gerth, *G.G.*, p. 613, the substantive in such phrases as *ἀνὴρ ὁ ἀγαθός* is defined only by the following phrase, and both

ἀνὴρ ὁ ἀγαθός and *ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ ἀγαθός* involve a contrast. *Οἱ νῦν* and *οἱ νῦν ἀνθρώποι* are sometimes barely distinguishable in sense from *ἀνθρώποι*, but to defend *τῶν νῦν* here we require examples of *οἱ ἀνθρώποι οἱ νῦν* and *ἀνθρώποι οἱ νῦν* so used; and I do not know of any.

This conversation must be designed to show that Agamemnon suspects nothing. The chorus meant that Agamemnon must not be misled by the simulated warmth of Clytemnestra's welcome, but Agamemnon, when he embarks on a disquisition on the effects of *jealousy*, and speaks of constitutional measures to combat the evil, shows clearly that he has misunderstood. In Clytemnestra's attitude to her husband jealousy has no part, and her infidelity, if known, is surely matter for instant action by the king himself, not for leisured consideration and public debate. In Agamemnon's subsequent conversation with Clytemnestra he addresses her as 'guardian of my house,' and shows, if I read him aright, some impatience at her preparations, but a willingness to do as she wishes (935, 947), and even to rally her on the extravagance of her welcome and her obstinacy in argument (906, 931). Nowhere does he treat her as he would be bound to treat her if he knew the truth,¹ and surely much of the poignancy of the situation depends on the confident self-sufficiency with which he fails to understand the hints of the chorus. It is this failure, as much as the generally disquieting course of the subsequent dialogue, which arouses in the chorus the forebodings expressed in 966 sqq.

1028 οἱ δ' οὔ ποτ' ἐλπίσαντες ἤμυσαν καλῶς
 ὦμοί τε δούλοις πάντα καὶ παρὰ στάθμην.
 ἔχεις παρ' ἡμῖν οἷά περ νομίζεται.
 1030 ἔξεις Αὐράτους.

Opinion is divided as to whether *παρὰ στάθμην* means 'beyond' the *στάθμη* or 'according to' it, 'unreasonable' or 'precise.' The phrase, however, occurs elsewhere,² and always with the second meaning; and since *στάθμη* is a plumb-line, τὸ σπαρτίον· στάθμην ἰθυτενῇ μολιβαχθεῖα (Suidas), *παρά* might perhaps be expected to have the force it has in *παρὰ ποταμόν*, not that which it has in *παρὰ νόμον*. But if *παρὰ στάθμην* means 'exact,' 'precise,' then *ὦμοί καὶ παρὰ στάθμην* is a ridiculous anticlimax, and it is probable that *παρὰ στάθμην* belongs to the next clause.

Moved, I suppose, by these considerations, Wilamowitz writes:

<πικροὶ πολίταις εἰς ἡμῶν ἐπηρμένους>
 ὦμοί τε δούλοις. πάντα κ.τ.λ.

but it is unnecessary to suppose a lacuna. We may accept *γε* from Thiersch³ and write:

ὦμοί γε δούλοις πάντα· καὶ παρὰ στάθμην
 ἔξεις παρ' ἡμῖν οἷά περ νομίζεται.

'Here you will have the regular allowances, and they will be regularly

¹ *Λήδας γένεθλον* in 905 is no doubt, as Verrall says, a sinister address, but it is not necessarily so meant by Agamemnon, and the whole scene is packed with dramatic irony. The form of words is not in itself remarkable; cf. 775.

² Theognis, 543, 945; Soph. *fr.* 421. In Eur.

Ion 1514 the metaphor seems to be different.

³ I have not seen Thiersch's note, but I suppose he wished to translate 'cruel even to excess.' If the *γε* is to be classified, it may be called apodotic. Examples of this usage are given by Neil in his edition of the *Knights*, pp. 199 sq.

distributed: there will be, for example, no unfairness such as Sceledrus complains of at Plaut. *Mil.* 348.

1321 ἅπαξ ἔτ' εἰπεῖν ῥῆσιν ἢ θρήνον θέλω
ἐμὸν τὸν αὐτῆς.

I agree with Professor Housman (*J. Phil.* 1888, p. 278) and Professor Platt (*C.R.* 1897, p. 96) that ῥῆσιν ἢ is intolerable, and with Professor Platt that it is probably patchwork. Remove ῥῆσιν ἢ, and the only natural and tolerable supplement seems to me to be πρὶν θανεῖν. Since, therefore, πρὶν θανεῖν may very easily have fallen out owing to the repeated -ειν, I conclude that that is what Aeschylus wrote.

Professor Platt takes exception to εἰπεῖν θρήνον, but it is defended by λέγειν παιᾶνα at 650. The paean there contemplated is a messenger's speech, that is to say senarii, and Cassandra's θρήνος is also in senarii. It is a θρήνος in substance but in form a ῥῆσις, and εἰπεῖν seems to me appropriate to its peculiar character. In any case the copyist who found a blank and filled it with ῥῆσιν ἢ did so because he had εἰπεῖν before him.

I would add that the word θρήνος, which is certified here both by ἅπαξ ἔτι and ἐμὸν τὸν αὐτῆς, seems fatal to Headlam's proposal to assign 1326-1329 to the chorus. The whole speech 1321-1329 will barely pass muster as a θρήνος as it is, and it will only pass by virtue of 1326-1329, which are in some sense Cassandra's epitaph. Give those lines to the chorus and she is left with only a curse, which is neither a θρήνος nor an adequate sequel to the weighty preface of 1321 sq. If something is lost after 1325, then the rest of the speech may go to the chorus; otherwise it must all be left to Cassandra.

1536 Δίκα δ' ἐπ' ἄλλο πρᾶγμα θήγει βλάβης
πρὸς ἄλλαις θηγάναις μοῖρα
δίκα h θηγάνει Hermann.

What is required in this sentence is an object to θήγει or θηγάνει. Musgrave's θηγάναις μάχαιραν or Housman's θηγάναισιν ἄορ would either of them do very well but for *Ch.* 643 Δίκας δ' ἐρείδεται πυθμῆν· | προχαλκεύει δ' αἶσα φασγανουργός, which defends μοῖρα¹ and, as a consequence, involves the dative δίκα. Emperius's θήγεται does not seem to me satisfactory, nor Auratus's δίκη, nor Headlam's tentative βλάβας. Βλάβης is not easily emended into any word meaning 'sword,' it is in itself appropriate to the context, and βλάβης θηγάναις, if that is how the words are to be taken, receives at least a qualified support from *Eum.* 861.

There is therefore no room in the existing sentence for the missing object²

¹ Cf. also *Ch.* 909 sq.

² It can just be got in by writing, with Heusde,

the unpleasant line Δίκα δ' ἐπ' ἄλλο πρᾶγμ' ἄορ
θήγει βλάβης.

and room must be made for it. Probably ἐπ' ἄλλο πρᾶγμα is a gloss on πρὸς ἄλλαις θηγάταις, and, if this is so, θήγει may well be right, for it is the form used by Aeschylus elsewhere, and syllabic correspondence is not required in lyric senarii.¹ Aeschylus's actual words are of course lost beyond recall, but he might, I imagine, have written something like:

Δίκη δὲ καὶνὸν φάσγανον θήγει βλάβης
πρὸς ἄλλαις θηγάταισι μοῖρα.

1651 XO. εἶα δὴ ξίφος πρόκωπον πᾶς τις εὐτρεπιζέτω.

AI. ἀλλὰ μὴν κἀγὼ πρόκωπος οὐκ ἀναίνομαι θανεῖν.

The repetition of πρόκωπος in 1652, where it bears an entirely different and otherwise unknown sense,² has been received with unusual tolerance by editors, and Wecklein's appendix records no objections to it. To me it seems exceedingly clumsy, and I suppose it to be due to a copyist's reminiscence of the preceding line. The word which Aegisthus should echo is not πρόκωπος but ξίφος, and the most obvious correction is ξιφήρης, which I find has already been proposed by Herwerden (*Mnemosyne*, 1892, p. 446). The word ξιφήρης, however, appears first in Euripides, and we should perhaps borrow from *Eum.* 595 the Aeschylean ξιφουλκός.³

A. S. F. Gow.

TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

¹ Cf., e.g., *Eum.* 169=174.

² The lexicons quote Herodian vii. 5, ἔχων πρόκωπον τὴν δεξιάν, 'hand on hilt,' which is an extension of the ordinary ἔχων πρόκωπον τὸ ξίφος

(cf. Suidas s.v.: cf. *Eur. Or.* 1477). It is still far from the supposed Aeschylean use.

³ *Eum.* 595 ξιφουλκῶ χειρὶ: cf. *Eur. Phoen.* 363 ξιφήρη χεῖρ' ἔχων.

EMENDATIONS IN PLATO'S *PHAIDROS*.

Phaidros, 230d.

THE sentence ὥσπερ γὰρ οἱ . . . ἄγουσιν, as it stands, seems to be unsatisfactory. The meaning is left too vague. We expect some such subject as βουκόλοι or ποιμένες after οἱ, and the object (τὰ πεινῶντα θρέμματα) of ἄγουσιν is placed awkwardly next to that of προσείοντες. We feel that προσείοντες goes too closely with ἄγουσιν to have anything to do with the article. It may be entirely detached by taking it more or less as a parenthetical remark. Instead of the article we must read the relative, as its antecedent ἐκεῖνοι can be dropped, according to other examples given in Ast's *Lexicon Platonicum*. Cf. *Gorgias*, 511e:

εἰδὼς ὅτι οὐδὲν αὐτοὺς βελτίους ἐξεβίβασεν ἢ οἱ ἐνέβησαν, κ.τ.λ.

In these two passages the relatives corroborate the evidence of B,T,P, and editors without reason follow F,t, here in reading οἱοι.

So the sentence runs: ὥσπερ γὰρ οἱ τὰ πεινῶντα θρέμματα, θαλλὸν ἢ τινα καρπὸν προσείοντες, ἄγουσιν, κ.τ.λ.

Phaidros, 236c.

The absolute use of εὐλαβήθητι.

Cobet tries to solve the difficulty by cutting the knot. Schanz and Burnet follow him in deleting this verb. It seems that the only objection taken to its presence is that its correct meaning has been a puzzle to editors. When the eye of a scribe has been deceived, or when a copyist has disturbed a passage, it is only fair to suppose that the source of error is to be discovered on the two pages of the MS. open before him at the time of writing the sentence in which the corruption is found. Now, no other passage occurs on the two pages of the facsimile B before us in which the presence of this verb is in the least required to give sense; nor can we entertain the idea that it has found its way into the text from a scholiast's marginal note. There is no occasion for annotation. We may add that this form of the imperative is too old and sound to be looked upon as more or less the usual thing a scholiast's fancy hits upon for annotations. So the only way open to us is to leave it undisturbed in its present position and explain it as best we can. If we punctuate differently by putting a comma and a dash after ἀλλήλοις, the sentence runs: ῥητέον μὲν γάρ . . . ἀλλήλοις,—εὐλαβήθητι καὶ μὴ βούλου κ.τ.λ. In Sophocles, *O.R.* 47, we

find this verb used absolutely: ἴθ', εὐλαβήθηθ', ὥς κ.τ.λ. 'Be on your guard'; or, as Jebb explains: 'Have a care for thy repute.' Here, too, in our passage a warning note is sounded, as is shown by the anticipatory thought: οὕτως ὅπως οἴός τε εἶ.

Cobet's method robs the sentence of its artistic effect, whereas its dramatic interest is fully sustained when we interpret the verb in the light of Sophoclean usage. The final clause is to be linked to the first part of the sentence, and not as T blundered by inserting a δέ after ἴνα, making it dependent on εὐλαβήθητι.

H. G. VILJOEN.

THE UNIVERSITY, GRONINGEN,
HOLLAND.

our guard';
ur passage
ght: οὕτως

ts dramatic
of Sopho-
e sentence,
pendent on

VILJOEN.

ON THE ARISTOTELIAN USE OF ΛΟΓΟΣ: A REPLY.

In the June issue of the *Classical Review* Professor Cook Wilson announces his conversion to the view that in 'a well-defined group' of passages in the *Nicomachean Ethics* λόγος means Reason. While I cannot hope to re-convert Professor Cook Wilson, I feel that it is worth while to try to express the reasons for which it seems difficult to follow him.

The most central of the passages in which he gives λόγος this meaning is the definition of ἡθικὴ ἀρετὴ in 1106 b 36: ἔστιν ἄρα ἡ ἀρετὴ ἕξις προαιρετική, ἐν μεσότητι οὖσα τῇ πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ὠρισμένη λόγῳ καὶ ὡς (or ᾧ) ἂν ὁ φρόνιμος ὀρίσειεν. The fact that this is a definition precludes loose or popular phraseology, and if λόγος here means Reason, it must be admitted that such a use of the word is regular or technical in Aristotle's philosophical writing. My chief objections to accepting the suggested translation 'prescribed by Reason' are as follows: (1) There is, so far as I know, no list of 'parts' or faculties of ψυχὴ in the works of Aristotle which contains the term λόγος. In the *Ethics* itself we are familiar with the phrase τὸ λόγον ἔχον, which implicitly denies that λόγος is a faculty; and in the sixth book we have (a) a list of the three controlling principles of πρᾶξις and ἀλήθεια (αἴσθησις, νοῦς, ὀρεξις—1139 a 18); (b) a list of the five sources of true judgment (τέχνη, ἐπιστήμη, φρόνησις, σοφία, νοῦς—1139 b 16): in neither list is λόγος to be found. Its place, we shall have to say, is taken in both cases by νοῦς. But surely it is unlike Aristotle to use in the actual defining formula of one of the central terms of the treatise an ambiguous synonym for νοῦς, without a word of explanation, instead of the unambiguous term νοῦς itself. (2) The form of the phrase ὠρισμένη λόγῳ seems to me to give a presumption against the translation 'prescribed by Reason.' When the passive voice of ὀρίζειν is joined with a noun in the dative, that noun is never the defining faculty, or judge, or legislator, but rather the standard, or measure, or mark, by which the definition is effected: it is, in fact, the ὅρος in question. The middle use is similar. 'Ὀρίζεσθαι τι τινί means to distinguish something by a certain mark, the mark being in the dative. In the active the subject is properly the mark, but often there is a personal or quasi-personal subject, as in the concluding clause of the sentence under discussion. The following are typical instances—(a) passive: *de An.* 435 b 16 τῇ ἀφ᾽ ὧ ὥρισται τὸ ζῆν; *Pol.* 1235 a 23 πάντα τῷ ἔργῳ ὥρισται; *N.E.* 1115 b 22 ὀρίζεται ἕκαστον τῷ τέλει—(b) middle: *N.E.* 1166 a 10 τούτων δέ τινι καὶ τὴν φιλίαν ὀρίζονται; *N.E.* 1170 a 16 τὸ δὲ ζῆν ὀρίζονται τοῖς ζώοις δυνάμει αἰσθήσεως—(c) active: *De Caelo* 293 b 13 τὸ δ' ὀρίζον τὸ πέρασ· *Ib.* 297 b 34

ὁ ὀρίζων κύκλος; *Phys.* 219 a 22 τὸν χρόνον γνωρίζομεν, ὅταν ὀρίσωμεν τὴν κίνησιν, τῷ πρότερον καὶ ὕστερον ὀρίζοντες. I am unable to find in Aristotle any parallel to the phrase ὀρισμένη λόγῳ if λόγος is taken to stand for the faculty of Reason. The phrase ought to mean that, in one of the various applications of the term ὅρος, a λόγος is the ὅρος of the μεσότης in which ἠθικὴ ἀρετὴ is said to consist. If it means that, the translation 'reason' seems to be out of the question.¹ (3) Instead of following Professor Cook Wilson in detail into an examination of the various passages which he adduces to illustrate and support his contention, I will now try to state the interpretation of λόγος which seems to me to be the true one. In so proceeding I follow the Aristotelian principle that the proofs of one theory are the difficulties of its rival; and the procedure in this case is the more necessary because Professor Cook Wilson has done less than justice to the view from which he is a convert. I start from the following passage of the *De Partibus Animalium*:

πρὸς δὲ τούτοις, ἐπεὶ πλείους ὀρώμεν αἰτίας περὶ τὴν γένεσιν τὴν φυσικὴν, οἷον τὴν τε οὐ ἔνεκα καὶ τὴν ὅθεν ἢ ἀρχὴ τῆς κινήσεως, διοριστέον καὶ περὶ τούτων, ποία πρώτη καὶ δευτέρα πέφυκεν· φαίνεται δὲ πρώτη, ἣν λέγομεν ἔνεκά τινος· λόγος γὰρ οὗτος, ἀρχὴ δ' ὁ λόγος ὁμοίως ἔν τε τοῖς κατὰ τέχνην καὶ ἐν τοῖς φύσει συνεστηκόσιν. ἢ γὰρ τῇ διανοίᾳ ἢ τῇ αἰσθήσει ὀρισάμενος ὁ μὲν ἱατρὸς τὴν ὑγίειαν, ὁ δ' οἰκόδομος τὴν οἰκίαν, ἀποδιδόασιν τοὺς λόγους καὶ τὰς αἰτίας οὗ ποιοῦσιν ἑκάστου, καὶ διότι ποιητέον οὕτως (639 b 11-19).

The passage deals, it is true, with τέχνη not ἀρετή, with ποιήσεις not πράξεις, but the comparison of the two forms of activity given in *N.E.* II. iv. does not exhibit any distinction of principle between them on the intellectual side, while the closely parallel definitions of φρόνησις and τέχνη given in *VI.* iv.² suggest an identity of principle. Of the various kinds of cause, says Aristotle, the primary is the final cause, which is a λόγος or plan. Such a plan is at the bottom equally of every fact in nature and of every production of art. With the aid of thought and sense the doctor comes to apprehend the health, the architect the building which he intends to create; and in this way each provides himself with a plan or ideal which is the justification or explanation of his actual procedure. Health in a particular person in the one case, a particular building in the other, is the product of the completed activity; and it is of the essence of the activity that foreknowledge of this result is present in the agent. It is this that constitutes his art: for ἡ τέχνη λόγος τοῦ ἔργου

¹ Nothing in Professor Cook Wilson's article is so surprising as the last paragraph: 'The conclusion then is that in all the passages reviewed λόγος means Reason in one of three senses; either (1) reason as the faculty of reason, or principle of reason in the soul, or (2) reason as reasoning, or (3) reason as what is reasonable, in the sense of the deliverance of reason—reason as ordaining the moral law, reason as inculcating it, or the moral law itself as a form of reason.' If by

translating 'reason' the translator commits himself to nothing more than to one of the three senses of the word there given, the word is monstrously ambiguous, and had better vanish from our philosophical vocabulary.

² τέχνη is ἡ μετὰ λόγου (or μετὰ λόγου ἀληθοῦς) ποιητικὴ ἔξις, while φρόνησις is ἡ μετὰ λόγου ἔξις πρακτικὴ or (1140 b 5) ἔξις ἀληθοῦς μετὰ λόγου πρακτικῆς.

ὁ ἄνευ τῆς ὕλης ἐστίν (640 a 31). The activity is thus the materializing (if the word will pass) of a form: for that which at the beginning of the activity presents itself as an end (οὗ ἕνεκα) becomes finally the form of the matter operated upon. The same account, *mutatis mutandis*, holds good of action. Action originates (N.E. VI. 1139 a 31) in a προαίρεσις, or determination of will, which originates in a desire on the one hand and a conceived plan (λόγος ὁ ἕνεκά τινος) on the other. Προαίρεσις is not itself the οὗ ἕνεκα, but springs from the apprehension of a οὗ ἕνεκα or end. This end is the explanation of the details of the action, and the achievement embodied in the completed action. Foreknowledge of the achievement is implied in the agent. It is this, indeed, that constitutes his intellectual virtue: for ὁρθὸς λόγος περὶ τῶν τοιούτων φρόνησις ἐστίν (1144 b 27).¹ In action, as in art, the activity is the materializing of a form: the 'end' of deliberation becomes the form of the matter which the action is designed to affect. There is, it is true, a difficulty here and a failure of correspondence between τέχνη and φρόνησις: for in action the φρόνιμος is in a sense both agent and patient, he is house as well as architect. The difficulty is stated, but not solved, by Aristotle when he gives as the matter of action πάθη and πράξεις, and when he bases the distinction of ποίησις and πρᾶξις on the fact that the former looks to a result beyond itself, the latter not. The problem raised by such statements is a profound one, not hitherto solved to general satisfaction by any philosopher; but it should not be allowed to obscure the fact that for Aristotle all distinctively human activity is one in principle. It is always the imposition of a certain preconceived form upon its appropriate matter; and his name for this form is λόγος.

When the plans are drawn, the architect's next business is to calculate and price the quantities. With a well-drawn plan for guide this process, though it may be long and laborious, is not difficult. It needs only care and accuracy, not insight. In action what corresponds is the process of βούλευσις, and the name given to the quantitative rightness achieved is μεσότης. Clearly the calculation must start from a plan and must be determined throughout by it: the μεσότης is, as Aristotle says, ὠρισμένη λόγῳ. If you ask 'What plan?' Aristotle can only answer that rightness of plan is the intellectual side of goodness, the investigation of which is to come later in the treatise: to be φρόνιμος is to be consistently right in that respect.² But without a right plan, whether

¹ This passage is cited by Professor Cook Wilson in connexion with N.E. II. 1103 b 31, which seems to him to imply that 'the ὁρθὸς λόγος meant in itself an ἀρετή.' He concludes, 'it cannot therefore be rule or definition, and must be Reason.' I cannot admit the conclusion, and I do not think the translation 'Reason' suits the passages any better than it suits the parallel passage above quoted from *De Part. An.* Art and φρόνησις are both thought of primarily as forms of knowledge, and what the agent has in mind is in each case a λόγος—what Höfding and other modern writers call 'the idea of an end.' Further, 'Reason' has never been in English

the name of a virtue. Therefore, even if the ὁρθὸς λόγος is an ἀρετή, the translation 'Reason' is not justified.

² With regard to the difference of reading ὥς and ὡ in 1107 a 1, the latter (preferred by Bywater) is impossible for Professor Cook Wilson and other champions of *Vernunft*: both are possible for me. I cannot understand, however, much hesitation as to which is preferable. With the reading ὡ the last clause is a direct answer to the very relevant question, 'What plan?' So Aspasius in his Commentary (ed. Heylbut, 48, 20): καὶ ἐπεξηγεῖται ποῖω λόγῳ τῷ τοῦ φρονίμου καὶ ὡς ἂν ὁ φρόνιμος ὀρίσειεν.

of the agent's own construction or accepted from another, there can be no goodness at all. For the λόγος, which is from one point of view a plan, or end, or ideal, or intention, is from another the form or principle, the soul of the action; and every good act is a manifestation both of ἠθικὴ and of διανοητικὴ ἀρετή.

In conclusion I turn to Professor Cook Wilson's difficulty with the phrase ὥς ὁ λόγος τάττει and other similar phrases. It may be thought that to interpret λόγος as a form or plan is to make this difficulty more acute. My answer, summarily stated, would be—(1) that the λόγος expounded by the philosopher is both a plan, realizable as a form, of life and an injunction: so much is implied in the theory that ethical speculation is meaningless unless it has a practical use (see esp. 1103 b 27): (2) that the λόγος in the φρόνιμος is similarly both something apprehended by him in virtue of his φρόνησις and a command which he accepts: (3) that the law of the state (which is a λόγος) commands, exhorts, and encourages; and we do not therefore conclude that the law is either a person or a human faculty. We know that what is implied is that laws assume the imperative mood. It is the same in all three cases. In the passage already quoted from the *De Part. An.* the artistic λόγος is said not only to explain the artist's procedure but also to issue reasoned injunctions (διότι ποιητέον οὕτως). So the agent's plan comes to him as a command; and it is not very strange to regard the necessity with which it controls deliberation as speech in the imperative mood.

J. L. STOCKS.

ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, OXFORD.

LY

can be no
lan, or end,
soul of the
διανοητικῇ

the phrase
to interpret
My answer,
philosopher is
is implied
a practical
ilarily both
mand which
commands,
the law is
lied is that
es. In the
is said not
injunctions
mand; and
deliberation

STOCKS.

ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ, XXX. 3-4.

A SIMPLE transposition in the text would, I venture to suggest, remove one or two of the many difficulties of this obscure chapter.

We are told at the end of section 2 that the Hellenotamiae who are administering the funds, although elected ἐκ τῶν αἰὲ βουλευόντων, are not to sit in the Boule: τοὺς δὲ ἑλληνοταμίας οἳ ἂν διαχειρίζωσι τὰ χρήματα μὴ συμβουλευεῖν. This statement is in itself clear and intelligible. I need not here go into the questions which have been raised as to its relation to the other clause about the Hellenotamiae farther back in the same section, and as to the language and interpretation of that clause.

Section 3 deals with the constitution of the four councils: βουλὰς δὲ ποιῆσαι τέτταρας κ.τ.λ. Each of these, in an order to be determined by lot, is to hold office in turn, and for one year: καὶ τούτων τὸ λαχὸν μέρος βουλεύειν . . . καὶ εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν βουλεύειν.¹ The intervening clauses, which provide for the distribution of the 100 commissioners and 'the others'² to the four λήξεις, do not concern us.

At the beginning of section 4 there is an obvious lacuna. The MS. text runs: εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν βουλεύειν | δὲ ἣ ἂν δοκῇ αὐτοῖς ἄριστα εἶξιν. Evidently a word has dropped out after βουλεύειν. Mr. H. Richards (v. *Class. Rev.* 1891, p. 228) has convincingly supplied the missing word, βουλεύεσθαι (cf. βουλεύσασθαι just below, and XXIX. 3, XXXI. 2), which has been accepted by Sandys and by Kenyon in his Berlin edition. The omission is satisfactorily accounted for by the similarity of the words βουλεύειν βουλεύεσθαι, aided perhaps by the position of βουλεύειν at the end of a line in the papyrus.

The first half, then, of section 4 (βουλεύεσθαι δὲ down to τῆς αὐτῆς ἡλικίας) directs that the Council of the year are to consult as they think best for the safe custody and proper expenditure of the funds and for the discharge of their business in general to the best of their power; if they wish to consult with more persons, they are to call in each an assessor, whomsoever he will of those of the same age.

Two serious objections here present themselves. (1) The custody and administration of the funds have been already committed to responsible special boards, and can hardly be described as the main and peculiar province of the

¹ I put a colon after the former βουλεύειν and after διακληρώσαι, and take the subject of the latter βουλεύειν (if it needs any definite subject)

to be τὸ λαχὸν μέρος. K-W insert τοὺς λαχόντας.

² Probably, I think, the qualified citizens serving in the fleet abroad.

Council. We may contrast section 5, and in a broader comparison the later chapters which deal with the functions of the normal Boule. The Athenian Council's control over finance was doubtless important, but was always rather a general supervision and direction than the particular duties here so specially assigned to it. Even the financial necessities of the moment do not justify this singular prominence. On the contrary, the purpose of the exclusion of the acting Hellenotamiae from the Council, as of the institution of the *πρόβουλοι* two or three years before, was surely to rescue the finances from the less competent hands of the larger body and emancipate the expert managers from its dangerous influence. (2) The Council, if we may trust our author and our text, was to be a very large and clumsy assembly of about 1,000 members. Critics have fastened especially upon that weak point in its constitution. It is difficult to believe that this over-manned Boule should have needed, or been authorised, to double its number by calling in assessors!

But if we transpose section 3 and the first half of section 4, we at once get a natural and apposite sense. The text will then run: *τοὺς δὲ ἑλληνοταμίᾱς οἱ ἂν διαχειρίζωσι τὰ χρήματα μὴ συμβουλεύειν· βουλευέσθαι δὲ ἢ ἂν δοκῇ αὐτοῖς ἄριστα ἔξειν περὶ τε τῶν χρημάτων, ὅπως ἂν σῶα ἢ καὶ εἰς τὸ δέον ἀναλίσκῃται, καὶ περὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὥς ἂν δύνωνται ἄριστα· κἂν τι θέλωσιν βουλευσάσθαι μετὰ πλειόνων ἐπεισκαλεῖν ἕκαστον ἐπίσκλητον ὃν ἂν ἐβέλῃ τῶν ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς ἡλικίας. βουλὰς δὲ ποιῆσαι τέτταρας κ.τ.λ.*

The duties here assigned to the Hellenotamiae are proper to them. The *περὶ τῶν ἄλλων* need not cause any misgivings, for (1) the Hellenotamiae had always something more to do than guard and pay out money, e.g. the collection of the tribute; (2) their amalgamation with the other treasurers of State funds, especially the Colacretae, enlarged their functions, as inscriptions of the years 410 to 404 testify; (3) it is a practice frequent in all legal documents to add an 'et cetera' to cover possible omissions. Compare, in the first section of the next chapter, *περὶ τῶν νόμων καὶ τῶν εὐθυνῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πράττειν ἢ ἂν ἡγῶνται συμφέρειν*.

The *ἐπίσκλητοι* to assist the Hellenotamiae would, of course, be the *πάρεδροι* of the inscriptions. Nothing is known of the mode of their appointment. Probably co-optation was the established practice, as with the *πάρεδροι* of the three chief Archons (LVI. 1).

The connection with the context at the end of the transposed passages is as smooth as at the beginning: *καὶ εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν βουλευέιν. τὰς δ' ἑδρας ποιεῖν τῆς βουλῆς κατὰ πενθήμερον κ.τ.λ.* From the constitution of the Council and its tenure we pass to its meetings, procedure, and business.

The dislocation is easily explained by the homoeoteleuton and homoeo-archon of the sentences, *συμβουλεύειν* and *βουλευέιν*, *βουλευέσθαι* and *βουλὰς* *δέ*. The two passages are of approximately equal length. It occurred to me that their metathesis might date from an original faulty copy of an inscription, and I have tried the experiment of putting them into epigraphic script of the period arranged *στοιχηδόν* in such a way that those two pairs of words stand at

the ends and the beginnings of lines respectively. But I cannot without recourse to Procrustean methods get them both quite to fit the spaces. We may, however, well believe that at some stage in the literary transmission of our text the cardinal words did so fall, and that an easy slip of the next copyist's eye transposed them. It is worth noting that the first scribe of the London papyrus seems to have found some temptation to displace the words *βουλὰς δὲ ποιῆσαι τέτταρας*, for he inserted them again in section 5 after *ἐναντίον τῆς βουλῆς*—(once more a word in *βουλ.*!)—but corrected himself 'inter scribendum' (K.).

J. A. R. MUNRO.

NOTE ON THUCYDIDES II. c. 48, § 3.

ἐγὼ δὲ οὖν τε ἐγένετο λέξω, καὶ ἀφ' ὧν ἂν τις σκοπῶν, εἴ ποτε καὶ αὐθις ἐπιπέσοι, μάλιστα ἂν ἔχοι τι προειδὼς μὴ ἀγνοεῖν, ταῦτα δηλώσω αὐτός τε νοσήσας καὶ αὐτὸς ἰδὼν ἄλλους πάσχοντας.

May a reader of Mr. Herbert Richards' *Thucydidea* briefly defend the manuscript reading in this familiar passage? In the October issue of the *Classical Quarterly* (vii. 245) Mr. Richards suggests καὶ πολλοὺς ἰδὼν, in place of καὶ αὐτὸς ἰδὼν. He says, 'The second αὐτός is very pointless, and a πολλούς seems wanted. We do not need to be told that he saw them himself, and hardly that he did see them; that he saw many is worth mentioning. Cf. Herod. I. 197 ἅσσα αὐτὸς ποιήσας ἐξέφυγε ὁμοίῳ νοῦσον ἢ ἄλλον εἶδε ἐκφυγόντα.' Would it not be truer to say that the words as they stand are full of point and of Thucydidean point?

Thucydides seldom refers to himself, but here he is frankly egotistic when historical truth demands it: ἐγὼ . . . αὐτός . . . αὐτός. He stresses, by repetition, his personal experience and his personal observation: he had himself fallen ill and himself seen the sufferings of others. His delight in the first-hand evidence he can offer as a surviving victim and as an eye-witness is no less keen here than in I. c. 22, § 1 (ὧν αὐτὸς ἤκουσα, with context), and in I. c. 22, §§ 2, 3 (οἷς τε αὐτὸς παρήν, with context). He brushes aside such speculations as the plague must have aroused long after it was over among thinking men, whether doctors or not, who knew of it only by hearsay. He has experiences and observations of his own to record for posterity: he is no mere reporter of what others told him they had felt or told him they had seen: he can show that he is imbued, in some degree, with the scientific spirit of his contemporary Hippocrates.

The chapter of Herodotus (I. 197) from which Mr. Richards quotes a few words seems to confirm the traditional text of Thucydides, who may well have had these travellers' tales in mind. In particular, a remembrance of the preceding clause εἴ τις καὶ αὐτὸς τοιοῦτον ἔπαθε ὁκοῖον ἂν ἔχη ὁ κάμνων ἢ ἄλλον εἶδε παθόντα may have led him deliberately to write αὐτὸς τε νοσήσας καὶ αὐτὸς ἰδὼν ἄλλους πάσχοντας [Mr. Richards gives νοσοῦντας against the manuscripts, probably by a slip of the pen]: 'I, the selfsame person, was not only myself stricken but myself saw others suffering.' 'Others,' be it noted, not 'another,' as Herodotus has it; and this modest plural (ἄλλους) is surely expressive enough without any addition whatsoever.

From the critical notes in Hude's text of Thucydides I see that Cobet would strike out the second αὐτός. For my own part (and I only wish I could carry with me so devoted a student of classical literature as Mr. Richards), I should be no less reluctant to omit the second αὐτός here than to omit the second or the third or the fourth αὐτός in the fragment of Aeschylus which Plato quotes at the end of the second book of the *Republic*.

W. RHYS ROBERTS.

October, 1913.

NOTES ON DARES AND DICTYS.

DARES.

C. i., p. 2, 12 (Meister's paging) dicit Peliae regi se eo uelle ire si uires sociique non deessent. Pelias . . . Argum . . . iussit . . . nauim aedificaret. Considering the next sentence read perhaps *naues* for *uires*.

C. ii., p. 3, 25. Graeci aduentare nauibus. mittit ad portam.

M reads *nauibus uti*. May this conceal *et ita*? cf. p. 11, 2. For change of tense cf. opening lines of C. iii.

C. iii., p. 5, 12. <quod ubi> Laomedonti regi nuntiatum est classem accessere et.

quod ubi, on the analogy I suppose of C. iv., p. 5, 24, is added by Meister against the grammar of the sentence. It must be deleted; cf. C. ii., p. 3, 20 with C. iii., p. 5, 13.

C. iv., p. 5, 24. Priamo nuntiatum est . . . praedam euctam.

euctam MG, *deuctam* Meister. Surely *auctam* is the word required. The MSS. reading arose from *praeduectam*.

C. viii., p. 10, 7. Antenorem a Grais contumeliose tractatum neque ab eis quicquam impetrasse.

There are four other passages similar—C. v., p. 7, 24; C. vi., p. 8, 11; C. xvii., p. 22, 7; C. xxxviii., p. 46, 6. Meister has thought it necessary to bring all these into harmony by making Antenore the subject. I can scarcely believe it necessary to ensure such harmony, but if it is it seems worthy of note that the passage quoted is the only one in which it is not Priam but Antenore who is contumeliously treated. Instead of Meister's changes then in C. v. and C. vi., I would here transpose *Antenorem* to after *neque*, and suppose *se* has dropped out after *contumeliose* as it has done in C. vi. in all the MSS. except F.

C. viii., p. 10, 18. dicere coepit Troianis extremum exitium futurum sed pulchrum in otio uitam degere.

There is no antithesis but a preference: read *et*.

C. xi., p. 14, 5. postea dictum est eos immortales factos, itaque Lesbios . . . quaesitum isse.

The Lesbians did not go to seek Castor and Pollux because they were afterwards thought immortal: read *itemque*.

C. xviii., p. 23, 3. de Aethiopia Perses et Memnon.

et must be deleted, There was no Perses at Troy, while in C. xl. Memnon is *Persarum rector*; cf. also Strab. p. 728, Diod. ii. 22, iv. 75.

C. xx., p. 25, 26. Hector Boetem Arcesilaum Prothoenorem occidit.

There is no Boetes at Troy. Read Boetos: there is a somewhat similar corruption in *Il. Lat.* 169; cf. also Dictys iii. 10.

C. xxi., p. 26, 19. Hector . . . Schedium †cleo liel phenorem occidit.

Corrected to *Schedium Elephenorem*. Perhaps *cleo* conceals *Clonium*. Cf. *Il. Lat.* 168; Dictys i. 13, 17.

C. xxi., p. 26, 23. Agamemnon . . . pugnam reuocauit. laeti Troiani in castra reuertuntur.

Transpose *in castra* to before the full stop. The Trojans always retreat *in oppidum, in urbem*, never *in castra*.

C. xxvi., p. 32, 1. succedit Pheres Admeti filius.

The only son of Admetus at Troy is Eumelus. *Pheres* is probably a marginal note *Pheris*, and has ousted Eumelus from the text, or the original may have read *Eumelus Pheris A. filius*. The name *Eumelus* must in any case, I think, be brought into the text.

C. xxvi., p. 32, 18. interea (i.e., during the truce) naues onerandas curat Palamedes.

o r n a n d a s is surely necessary. Why should he *load* the ships and with what?

C. xxvii., p. 33, 15. Agamemnon cum magno comitatu ad castra reuertitur.

There is no question of an imposing retinue. He has been deliberately insulted by being sent on the servile mission of helping other people to get provisions. Read *commeatu* and cf. Caes. *B.G.* i. 34.

C. xxviii., p. 34, 19. cui exultanti et gloriante Alexander Paris collum transfigit.

In both Dictys and Dares Paris is never called anything but Alexander: delete *Paris* here as a gloss.

C. xxxvi., p. 44, 3. Menelaus ad Scyrum uenit arma Achillis Neoptolemo filio eius tradit quae cum sumpsisset, Argiuorum castris . . . lamentatus est.

1. *Lycomedem* has probably dropped out before *Scyrum*, cf. C. xxxv.

2. Something has gone before *Argiuorum*. Meister supplies *uenit et in*. It is surely simpler to delete *Neoptolemo* and read *sumpsisset*. *Neoptolemus in*. *Neoptolemus* got into the line above by attraction to *filio* and became dative. Meister's *uenit* would still have *Menelaus* for subject.

C. xxxvii., p. 44, 21. ut consilium cogat.

Meister changes to *conuocet*, but cf. C. xxxi., p. 37, 14.

C. xli., p. 49, 9. ut hi suos omnibus . . . adducant.

Meister's *uti* is a needless refinement. Dares uses *hi* constantly; cf. p. 8, 8.

C. xli., p. 49, 20. Hecuba dum fugit cum Polyxena Aeneam incurrit. Polyxenam tradit ei.

So G. L reads *tradidisset* whence Meister's *tradit se*. It is surely easier to read *Polyxenam* with G. and understand *Hecuba* as subject of *tradit*. Polyxena has no mind of her own in any case though she has in Dictys. *Aeneas occurrit* L, but G.'s is the more vivid phrase. If *occurrit* is retained read *Aeneae*.

C. xlii., p. 51, 8. Agamemnonem poscit conqueritur exercitum accusat, Antenorem accersiri iubet.

Neoptolemus is the subject of *poscit*, but it is not his place to give orders and later it is Agamemnon who manages the whole business. Can Agamemnon have dropped out before *Antenorem*?

DICTYS.

I., c. ii, p. 4, 9. Atrei gratia etsi ea quae exhibebantur cum laetitia accipiebant tamen . . . templi pulcritudine afficiebantur.

For *Atrei gratia* Obrecht followed by Meister reads *reges Graeciae*, a phrase that is entirely unlike Dictys and has no point here at all. Could we read a *rerum gratia*?

I., c. viii., p. 7, 19. reguli . . . concilium irrumpunt atque inconditis moribus malum minitantur.

moribus seems to have incurred the censure of all the critics, though Meister retains it; perhaps we might read *motibus* = 'gestures', used of the gesticulation of an orator in Cic. *Brut.* 116.

I., c. xxiii., p. 17, 31. cum opportunum iam tempus nauigandi ingrueret. *ingrueret* can scarcely be right. I should prefer *urgueret*, cf. V., c. xvi., p. 100, 22 *urgente nauigii tempore*.

II., c. xxviii., p. 36, 15. Chryses praeferiens dei uultus.

uultus can hardly be right. Even if intelligible the phrase is too bold for Dictys, and Chryses had none of the majesty of Apollo. I think we must read *uittas*, cf. *Il. Lat.* 13, and Verg. *Aen.* vii. 237.

II., c. xlii., p. 45, 17. interea Ajax adueniens cognito apud naues Hectore . . . apparuit.

Meister apparently takes *Hectore* with *cognito*. But *cognito*, etc., is an absolute phrase = *cognito quod apud naues ageretur*. The clause appears often—e.g. p. 49, 18, but the sense is clear without it. I would read *Hectori dat.* after *apparuit*.

III., c. iii., p. 53, 33. scilicet quia fluxa fides et animi earum spectati.

? *nec* for *et*; but perhaps the MSS. reading originally was *earûs spectati* and *su-* dropped out before *spectati* (cf. p. 55, 12, *tendiet* for *tendi uidet*), and we should read *su spectati*.

III., c. xxiii., p. 59, 26. instantes tela iaciunt crebra magis quam cum effectū.

crebre is surely required to balance *cum effectū*, cf. in u. 25 *temere et cum audacia*.

III., c. xxiii., p. 66, 13. non enim Helenae . . . gratia exercitum . . . procul ab domo . . . militiam tolerare.

surely *ab* <ducere> *domo*.

V., c. vii., p. 92, 18. auspicio tali monitis omnium animis Calchas . . . hortatur, 'and explains.'

They were neither warned nor instructed till Calchas told them, but they were astounded like the enemy in u. 8. Read *attonitis*.

V., c. xvi., p. 100, 10. ceterum post abscessum Ulixi Hecuba . . . multa ingerere maledicta imprecarique infesta omina in exercitum.

Surely *Ulixis*. There is no sense in Hecuba heaping insults on a man who is not there, and it will not fulfil her plan of enraging the army since *Ulixes* has fled its hate.

VI., c. ii., p. 103, 15. Menestheus cum Aethra Thesei et Clymena filia eius . . . recipitur.

Meister's index reads *Aethra* (?) *filia Thesei*. But *mater* must have dropped out before *et* if only to balance *filia eius*. There is no tradition I know of making Aethra Theseus' daughter. This has surely been pointed out before, but I risk doing so here.

R. T. CLARK.

MONICH.

ON SOME PASSAGES OF OVID'S *TRISTIA*.

SINCE the publication of my critical edition in 1889 the *Tristia* of Ovid has received some attention. A paper in *Hermathena*, vol. vii. (1890) by Professor R. Ellis contains several conjectural emendations, and in a public lecture on *The Second Book of Ovid's 'Tristia'* (Clarendon Press, 1913), this veteran scholar analysed the intricate contents of Book II. Two learned pamphlets by Dr. R. Ehwald, *Ad historiam carminum Ovidianorum recensio-nemque symbolae* (I. Gotha, 1889; II. Gotha, 1892) deal with the history of the text, and the textual criticism and interpretation generally. Dr. Paul Vogel's *Kritische und exegetische Bemerkungen zu Ovid 'Tristien'* (Festschrift, Schneeberg [Sachsen] 1891) is a valuable contribution to the understanding of the text and its interpretation. I have made much use of these works in writing this paper. Though little has emerged in the way of new manuscript material, the important discovery has been made by Dr. Ehwald of the fragments of a tenth century manuscript in the town library of Trier. These fragments are our earliest authority, since the best manuscript L, the Marcianus, belongs to the eleventh century. These leaves which have been recovered formed the binding of a book. They contain, unfortunately, only I. xi. 1-31; I. xi. 33-II. 21; IV. iv. 35-65; IV. iv. 67-v. 9; their readings closely agree with our best manuscript L. The fragments are fully described by Dr. Ehwald, *Symbolae*, II., pp. 4 sqq.

I. i. 47, 48.

da mihi Maeoniden et tot circumspice casus:
ingenium tantis excidet omne malis.

Here the word *circumspice*, if taken in its literal sense, is obscure. 'Give me a Homer,' says Ovid, 'and look around upon my many misfortunes; his talent will be entirely destroyed by such great troubles.' One would naturally expect Ovid to say 'Give me a Homer and surround him with as many misfortunes as are mine,' and that is what Heinsius made him say by his conjecture *circumice*, which is accepted by some editors, and apparently by Professor Housman, *Manilius* I. p. lii. But *circumice* is unsatisfactory, since the verb, as far as I know, is nowhere used in Roman poetry. No alteration is necessary, for the meaning which *circumice* is intended to convey is actually the meaning of *circumspice*, which signifies 'provide for him.' *Circumspicere* means 'to look around for, look for,' and so 'provide,' as in the following passages: Verg. *Georg.* iii. 390, 'plenoque alium circumspice campo'; Livy i. 30 'Sabini

circumspicere et ipsi externa auxilia'; Juvenal viii. 95 'praeconem Chaerippe, tuis circumspice pannis'; Seneca *Dial.* i. 3. 3 'alius circumspiciatur cum quo conferre possimus manum.'

II. 77-80.

a! ferus et nobis crudelior omnibus hostis,
delicias legit qui tibi cumque meas,
carmina ne nostris quae te uenerantia libris
iudicio possint candidiore legi.

I wish to modify the explanation given of this passage in my critical edition, p. xcv. It is difficult to decide between *indicio* LHPV and *iudicio* G. I now think that *iudicio* is right; the meaning is:—'Alas! he was a heartless enemy and more cruel than all to me whoever he be that read to you my trifles with the intent that no portions of my books extolling you may be read with more friendly judgement on your part.' In my edition I accepted *indicio* which has greater MS. evidence. But the meaning obtained is unsatisfactory. Vogel has pointed out that a special *indicium* would not be necessary for an unprejudiced reading of Ovid's poems. Besides this, I object (i.) that one would expect *indice* not *indicio*, which cannot be equivalent to *indice*; (ii.) though *indicio candidiore* might be construed 'in consequence of more favourable information about my poems,' taking *indicio* in a colourless sense, which is slightly supported by *Pont.* I. v. 76 where 'indicium studii mei' means information about my poetry, and by *Trist.* II. 379 where 'indicio Homeri' means 'through information given by Homer,' the word *indicium* almost invariably has a bad connotation, standing for information or revelation of an unfavourable character, as *Trist.* III. 4, 71 'nec meus indicio latitantes uersus amicos | protrahit.' Thus to talk of a *candidius indicium* seems strange if not impossible.

Vogel proposes to read 'ne e nostris,' not only for the sake of greater clearness, but because two of my MSS., a Bodleian and a Copenhagen MS., have an erasure of one letter after *ne*. But as I stated in my apparatus the erased letter was *c*; confusions between *ne* and *nec* are frequent. As to the construction, I regard *nostris libris* as a poetical local ablative, like II. 437 'quorum libris modo dissimulata Perilla est' [*Perilla est* is my correction for *per illos* MSS.], which means 'those in whose books Perilla was lately a counterfeited name.' So *Ibis* 639; 'haec tibi tantisper subito sint missa libello.'

II. 83-86.

cum coepit quassata domus subsidere, partes
in proclinatas omne recumbit onus,
cunctaque fortuna rimam faciente dehiscunt
ipsa suoque eadem pondere tracta ruunt.

This, I now think, is the true reading of these disputed lines. In line 86 I have ventured to conjecture *suoque eadem* for *suo quodam* of the MSS. The

meaning is: 'When a tottering house begins to tumble, its whole weight subsides towards the leaning portions; and when chance causes a rift, all its structures crack; and moreover, dragged down by their own weight, collapse.'

II. ii. 89-92.

at, memini, uitamque meam moresque probabas
illo, quem dederas, praetereuntis equo:
quod si non prodest et honesti gloria nulla
redditur, at nullum crimen adeptus eram.

The last couplet, pronounced 'semibarbarus' by Heinsius, and rejected by many editors, appears corruptly in L.

Non quasi prodesset honesti gloria nulla
Redditus est (redditur et *m.* 3) nullum crimen adeptus erit (*eram m.* 3).

Ehwald *Symb.* II. 19 thinks it clear from the form in which it is given in L that the couplet is an interpolation of someone expressing his own view of the muster held by Augustus. But, as Vogel points out, the poet's purpose is to bring into prominence the *recognitio equitum*, as being a formal decision given by Augustus which was creditable to Ovid himself. The expression *crimen adipisci* is unusual, but though *adipisci* generally denotes to secure something good, it may be used of securing something bad, as in Tac. *Ann.* I. 74 'odium apud omnes adeptus.' I am inclined to think that my conjecture 'et honos et gloria' may be right; but *honestus* in the sense of 'having held honores (offices)' is Ciceronian. See *pro Mur.* § 87. The couplet would appear to be sound and to mean: 'And if the fact that I passed muster before you brings me no advantage, and no repute for distinction is accorded to me, yet it must be admitted that I had incurred no charge.'

II. ii. 109-114.

illa nostra die, qua me malus abstulit error,
parua quidem periit, sed sine labe domus:
sic quoque parua tamen, patrio dicatur ut aevo
clara nec ullius nobilitate minor,
et neque diuitiis nec paupertate notanda,
unde sit in neutrum conspiciendus eques.
sit quoque nostra domus uel censu parua uel ortu,
ingenio certe non latet illa meo.

The order of these lines given in the MSS. I now think correct. In line 113 *et neque*, GPV and most MSS., must be accepted rather than *ut neque* LH, and in line 115 *sit* the reading of most MSS. is superior to *si* LV, with which the omission of the verb is awkward. The meaning is: 'On that day on which a fatal mistake led me astray, a family was ruined which was stain-

less even if insignificant, though it is insignificant also with the reserve that it is described as distinguished in the time of our fathers, and as not inferior to the lineage of any, and as not remarkable either for riches or poverty, so that (*unde = ut inde ortus eques*) a knight sprung from it is noteworthy in neither of these respects. Also, even if my family is insignificant in property or extraction, my talent at least saves it from obscurity,' that is, my talent cannot be blamed for its remaining unknown.

II. 191-192.

Ciziges et cholchi metereaue turba ietaeque
Danubii mediis uix prohibetur aquis.

So L. The difficulties of this couplet are no reason why it should be rejected. It is obviously designed to emphasize the remoteness of Tomi, which is too vaguely indicated by the expression *egressus Histri* (189); and it is designed to move the reader's horror by the thought that the broad Danube scarcely protects the frontier post, the unhappy poet's residence, from the incursions of wild migratory tribes who lived in the savage regions beyond it extending even beyond the Maeotis. As to the first of those tribes *Īazyges*, the reading of most MSS. will not do, both on account of the impossible synizesis involved (the word is always scanned elsewhere *Īāzŷgēs*; *Ibis* 133; *Pont.* I. 2. 79; IV. 7. 9), and because this Sarmatian tribe lived on the lower Danube, too far west to be associated with the tribes mentioned close to it. The tribe is the *Ciziges*, whose name is correctly preserved by L. This Sarmatian tribe lived just beyond the Tanais on the Asiatic side of the Maeotis. It is hard to avoid supposing that they are identical with the *Cizici* of Pliny (*N.H.* VI. 19); Mayhoff gives this apparatus—*Cizici* DED *zizici* a *czici* R¹—with other variants. Mr. J. G. C. Anderson, whom I have consulted, remarks that the variation of terminations signifies little in a barbarous name. In that case the second tribe would seem to be the Colchi, who are a little further to the south. As to the enigmatical *Meterea* which contains the name of the third tribe, Ellis's conjecture *Teretæa* (*Hermathena* VII. 193) comes near enough to the MSS. and fits in well with the other tribes. The *Teretæ* or *Toretæ* were a tribe who lived a little east of the Maeotis, north of the Colchi. The fourth tribe are the *Getae*, as given by most MSS. With this tribe Ovid moves nearer home, for they lived north of the Danube. *Prohibentur* should of course be read with most MSS.

II. 253-254.

at matrona potest alienis artibus uti,
quoque trahat, quamuis non doceatur, habet.

So L and most MSS. The meaning is 'But it may be objected that the married woman can make use of artifices intended for others, and she finds in your poems the means by which she can attract, though the lessons are not addressed to her.' I am glad that Vogel supports me in this view. Many editors read *quodque* with the Gothanus and some inferior MSS., and this

reading is defended by Ehwald, *Symb.* II. p. 19. *Trahat* is then taken in the medical sense of 'contract by infection'—'she finds in your poems some corruption that she can contract.' This is less simple than the explanation which I have given, and having indifferent MS. support has little to recommend it. Though the medical sense of *trahere* is paralleled by *Pont.* III. 2. 14 'uicinum metuens ne trahat inde malum,' the sense 'to attract' is equally well supported by *A. A.* III. 421 'se quoque det populo mulier speciosa uidendam: | quem trahat, e multis forsitan unus erit.'

II. ii. 277-278. *

'at quasdam uitio.' quicumque hoc concipit, errat,
et nimium scriptis arrogat ille meis.

So L, which here shows its excellence. Other MSS. have 'quasdam uitiat, quaedam uitia,' and so forth. The meaning is 'But, say my critics, some women have turned your *Ars* to a corrupt use'—'quasdam uitio uertisse meos libros arguunt obrectatores.' Ehwald makes it probable that the reference in *quasdam* is to both the elder and younger Julia (*Symb.* II. 20). Conjectures such as that of Vogel 'atque metum uitii' are superfluous.

II. ii. 279-282.

ut tamen hoc fatear, ludi quoque semina praebent
nequitiae: tolli tota theatra iube:
peccandi causam multis quam saepe dederunt,
Martia cum durum sternit harena solum.

The meaning is 'But even if I admit the charge just made, the pageants also provide incentives to immorality, so order wholesale suppression of the theatres: how often have the pageants afforded to many an occasion of sinning, when the sand is strown on the hard ground in the amphitheatre of Mars.' The *ludi* were a combination of theatrical, gladiatorial, and other performances. It was at the *ludi* that comedies, and especially, under the Empire, the indelicate mimes were presented. The *ludi* were a time of public merry-making, and led to looseness especially through two means which Ovid mentions: (1) the theatres; (2) the gladiatorial and other shows, which brought the sexes together as spectators. It is thus clear that *ludi* is the subject both of *praebent* (279) and *dederunt* (281): there is therefore no reason for Ehwald's conjecture *mimi* for *multis*, which involves the further alteration of *cum* to *cur*: nor is *munera* for *mimi* required, proposed by Vogel as it had been proposed by Heinsius before him.

II. ii. 409-410.

est et in obscenos commixta tragoedia risus,
multaque praeteriti uerba pudoris habet.

Here *commixta* is due to GHP. *Commista* is found in V, and the third hand of L, the original reading of which is erased, but was probably *commixta*.

The other MSS. have *deflexa*, accepted by most editors, in supposed allusion to the Satyric drama in which 'tragedy was diverted to obscene jokes.' But *commixta*, which I restored to the text, gives a better sense, and is approved by Vogel and Ehwald (*Jahresbericht*, 1902, p. 283), who compares Plaut. *Amph.* 59 'faciam ut commixta sit (haec) tragicomoedia.' The meaning is: 'tragedy has been made composite in character (has not been kept pure) in order to provoke indecent laughter.' The reference is probably to the *ἰλαροτραγωδία* of Rhinthon, which were burlesques of tragic themes. On this obscure writer some light has lately been thrown by Lejay in his edition of Horace's *Satires*, p. xlii., and Michaut, *Sur les Tréteaux latins*, p. 128.

III. 1. 47.

causa superpositae scripto est testata coronae:
servatos ciuis indicat huius ope.

Thus the couplet is given in Lord Leicester's MS. (H); the other MSS. omit *est*, which was added conjecturally by Ehwald after *coronae*. It has been proved from inscriptions that the legend OB. CIVIS. SERVATOS was placed on the 'querna corona' itself (Ehwald, *Jahresb.* 1893, p. 100; *B.P.W.* 1890, p. 1624): the meaning is 'the reason for the crown fixed above the door is attested by the legend on it.'

III. 3. 21.

si iam deficiam subpressaue lingua palato,

So the MSS. The conjecture of Heinsius *deficiat* is usually accepted. But no alteration is required; *deficiat* must be understood with *lingua* from *deficiam*. Iuv. xiii. 141 'quia tu (es) gallinae filius albae nos (sumus) uiles pulli.' See below on III. 12. 1.

III. 7. 27-28.

forsitan exemplo, quia me laesere libelli,
tu quoque sis poenae facta secuta meae.

Ovid is addressing the young poetess Perilla, who he fears has abandoned poetry through terror at the disaster it has brought upon himself. Various conjectures have been made with a view to maintaining *facta*—*retusa* by Ellis (*Hermathena* vii. 211) and Zingerle (*N. Phil. Rundschau*, 1890, p. 70) independently, but this un-Ovidian word seems out of place; *quieta* by Vogel, which is tame; *soluta* (slack) by myself, to which Vogel objects that *solutus* means 'set free from pressure or coercion.' It does often, but Cic. *Rull.* II. 91 'urbem ipsam solutam ac debilitatam' supports my meaning. Other conjectures in my edition. But I am now inclined to think that *secuta* is right and *facta* wrong, and to accept *fata* from the early printed editions, apparently an

Italian conjecture. The meaning is: 'perhaps in consequence of the lesson of my punishment, because my writings have been my ruin, you have submitted yourself to destiny'; you have resolved to write no more since *fatum* seems to bring ruin on authors of poetry. Verg. *Aen.* I. 382 'data fata secutus.'

III. 10. 11-12.

dum †patet et boreas et nix habitare sub arcto,
tum patet has gentes axe tremente premi.

The *patet* of line 11 is clearly a corruption due to *patet* in line 12. Various alterations have been proposed. I now suggest 'dum prohibet Boreas,' etc. For *prohibere* followed by infinitive see *Pont.* I. 5. 51 'hoc quoque me studium prohibent adsumere uires.' *Prohibet* contracted may have easily become *patet* on account of the succeeding *patet*, and *et* following it is due to (metrical?) dittography. The same idea is repeated in *Pont.* I. 3. 35; 'quocumque aspicias campi cultore carentes, uastaque, quae nemo uindicat, arua iacent.' The rather rare use of *patet* impersonally in line 12 is supported by Her. 16. 32 'iuuenem facti paenituisse patet.'

III. 12. 1-2.

frigora iam Zephyri minuunt, annoque peracto
longior antiquis uisa Maeotis hiems.

So the MSS. Editors regard *Maeotis* as corrupt, on account of the shortening of the diphthong; thus Lachmann altered it to *Tomitis*, and Vogel, supposing it to conceal the finite verb, reads 'uim moderatur hiems.' These are counsels of despair. I now think that Ovid wrote *Maeotis* and scanned it *Maēōtis* as a metrical experiment, imitating the shortening of diphthongs found sometimes in Greek poets. That by the law of Latin Phonetics such shortening is permissible is shown by the prosody of Plautus, where we find Pellaeus as a dactyl in *Asin.* 333 (Lindsay, *Captivi* [1890], Introd., p. 19), by the scan-sions 'praēcacutus,' 'praēeunte,' 'praēustus' (L. Müller, *De re Metr.* ed. 2, pp. 287 sqq.), and by the form 'prehendo,' which we print although MSS. show 'praehendo.'

I believe that Ovid shortened 'Maēōtis' in imitation of Euripides *Herc.* 409 *Μαιῶτιν ἀμφί*, which words in the strophe correspond to *διῆλθε τὸν τε* in the antistrophe. The choric ode in which this occurs, *Herc.* 348-450, appears to be written in exact syllabic correspondence. Besides line 400, *Μαιῶτιν*, there are only two other uncertain places, line 374 *ἱππέλαις ἐδάμαζον* in the antistrophe corresponding to *τοῖς θανούσιν ἄγαλμα* in the strophe; and line 350 *τὰν καλλίφθιτον* (MSS.) *κιθάραν* in the strophe corresponding to *ἔστρωσεν τόξοις φονίους* in the antistrophe. As to *ἱππέλαις* I believe that here again the diphthong is scanned short, as I have marked it, on the same principle, which removes the anomaly. As to the second case, Professor Gilbert Murray in his

edition follows Verrall in reading τὸν κάλλει φθιτόν, which violates the syllabic correspondence. The MSS. are corrupt; but if the emendation of Stephanus τὰν κάλλιφθῶγγόν be accepted, the syllabic correspondence is re-established. It seems hardly possible to resist the conclusion that Stephanus was right. There is a similar shortening of Νυσαίων in Soph. *Antig.* 1131.

It is a fact beyond question that Greek poets did shorten diphthongs when standing before a vowel in certain cases, particularly where the words are adjectives. Thus we find ἔμπαῖον (*Od.* XX. 379), χαμαῖενάδες (*Od.* X. 243), οἶος (*Il.* XIII. 275), νῆός (*Il.* IV. 473), and in tragedy παλαιός (*Soph. fr.* 655; *Eur. El.* 497), γεραίός (*Eur. Hec.* 64; *Herc.* 446, 901) πετραῖα (*Soph. Antig.* 827), δέιλαῖος (*Antig.* 1310). In Soph. *O.C.* 200 and 238 γεραῖον stands in Jebb's text; it is so found in the MSS. in 238, in 200 it is Dindorf's correction for the γεραιόν of the MSS. This is interesting because it indicates that there was a tendency to slur over in pronunciation a diphthong followed by a vowel, a weakening of quantity due to conversational pronunciation. The same is indicated by the spellings παλαός, παλεός, for παλαιός, and the forms τέλειος, τέλεος, αἰεί, ἀεί. Professor Gilbert Murray, who has given me his opinion on this point, says, 'personally I don't think there is any valid objection to Μαῖῶτις from the Greek side. . . . The syllable αἰ was evidently in practical speech apt to be short: the spellings παλεός, etc., occur very early; again, -μαι -ται in verbs is elided in Epic,¹ and in Menander, *Epitrepontes*, 138, 140, 226, and (*me iudice*) in the *Iph. Aul.* 407 βούλομ' ἀλλά. So καί is elided (without crasis) in ὥσπερ Ἀρμόδιος κ' Ἀριστογείτων and other cases.' In *Eur. Hēr.* 1128 ὦ δρυμὸς ὄρεϊος, ὅθι κυνῶν, Professor Murray keeps the text scanned thus, with the approval, he tells me, of Wilamowitz, who formerly suggested ὄρεος on the analogy of τέλεος. This practically means that the spelling was indifferent, or rather that the forms τέλεος παλεός, etc., were invented to suit the pronunciation, perhaps by the learned. I think this is the truth; and in the above passages of Sophocles Jebb would have done well to read γεραιόν in both lines. Such weakening of quantity is found with long vowels as well as diphthongs. Thus we find βέβληαι (*Il.* XI. 380), Πῖσα (*Pind. Ol.* II. 3, *Bacchyl.* V. 182), and Νηρεῖς beside Νηρηῖς. More difficult is the case of πατρῶος found in *Pind. Nem.* IX. 14, and in *Eur. Alc.* 249, *Tro.* 162, *Med.* 431; in Euripides Professor Murray restores πάτριος. But it seems likely that here also the MSS. are correct, and present a further instance of weakening of quantity. At any rate ἥρως (*Od.* VI. 303), κολφῆ *Antimach. fr.* 37 Kink., are undisputed. Cicero's remarks on shortening in hiatus, which he regarded as archaic, are interesting in this connexion (*Orat.* 152). The weakening of ω is illustrated by the shortened forms Brittōnes Vascōnes (*Juv.* XV. 124 and 93) beside Βρίττωνες (Procop.) Οὐάσκωνες (Strabo).

In further illustration of this paradox that apparent false quantities are to be encountered in the best classical poets I take this opportunity of defending

¹ And Aristophanes. See Kühner-Blass, *Gk. Gr.*, I. 237.

the following readings retained in my text of Juvenal, VI. 167 *Venusinam*, VII. 15 *equitesque Bithyni*, VII. 204 *Thrasy-machi*, XIV. 9 *ficedulas*.

Quantities, especially of proper names, were often unmanageable in verse. Greek authors complain of this: Thus Critias *P.L.G.*, ed. 4, p. 282: οὐ γὰρ πως ἦν τοῦνομ' ἐφαρμόζειν ἐλεγεῖω; Arcestratus 39: ἰχθύος ἀνξήθεντος ὃν ἐν μέτρῳ οὐ θέμις εἰπεῖν. So Lucilius 228, Marx: 'seruorum est festus dies hic, quem plane hexametro uersu non dicere possis.' There are similar complaints in Horace (*Sat.* I. 5. 87), Ovid (*Pont.* IV. 12 on Tūtīcānus), Martial (IX. 11 on Ĕārīnus), Pliny (*Ep.* VIII. 4. 3 on Dacian proper names), Apollinaris Sidonius (*Carm.* 22. 485). Therefore Greek poets allowed themselves some latitude and tended to lengthen the first in a sequence of short syllables. Homer has Πρίαμος but Πρίαμίδης, Ἀπόλλων but Ἀπόλλωνος (so Ap. Rhod. I. 403, Callim. *Hymn Ap.* 17), Callimachus (*Hymn Del.* 326) has Ἀπόλλων. The Romans followed them. Virgil has 'Priamus' but 'Priamides,' 'Siculus' but 'Sicelides,' 'Italia' but 'Italus,' 'Diana' (*Aen.* I. 499, cf. Hor. *Carm.* IV. 7. 25, Ov. *M.* VIII. 353), but 'Diana' (*Aen.* VII. 306, cf. Ov. *M.* VIII. 385, Grattius, 253). A violent instance of variation is Hor. *Carm.* III. 4. 9 'me fabulosae Vulture in Āpulo nutricis extra limen Āpulīae,' where no change should be made in the text. Ovid has 'Io' (*Aen.* I. 3. 21), but 'Īo' (*Her.* 14. 103, *Ibis* 624). Virgil has 'Sithōnius' (*Ec.* 10. 66) with Lycophron 1357, though the *o* is long in Herodotus. Virgil has 'Fidenae' (*Aen.* VI. 773), but Horace (*Ep.* I. 11. 6) and Propertius (IV. 1. 36) 'Fidenae.' 'Sidōnius' is usual though the stem of 'Sidon' is long (Hor. *Ep.* I. 10. 26). Juvenal has 'Scantīnius' (II. 44), but Ausonius (*Epigr.* 92. 4, Peiper) 'Scantīnius.' 'Grādius' is found forty-nine times against 'Grādius' four times (M. Warren, *Am. Journ. Phil.* IV. No. 13). Catullus (29. 3) has 'Māmurra,' but Horace (*Sat.* I. 5. 37) and other poets 'Māmurra.' Propertius (I. 19. 7) and Ovid (*A. A.* II. 356) have 'Phylacides,' but Ovid (*T. V.* 14. 39) 'Phylaceius.' Propertius (III. 1. 29), Ovid (*Her.* 5. 94, *M.* XII. 547), and Persius (1. 4) have 'Pōlydamas.' The Greek is Πολυδάμας, but it is wrong with some editors to read in these passages 'Pulydamas' (Πουλυδάμας), since the long *o* probably came from a Doric or Aeolic form Πωλυδάμας, as in the case of 'pōlypus' (Hor. *Sat.* I. 3. 40), where the dialectic form was introduced through the κοινὴ λέξις. 'Batāus' and 'Batāus' are both found (Mart. VI. 82. 6 Friedländer); Statius has 'Nerēis' but 'Nerēida' (*Achill.* I. 24. 158); 'Pālatinus' is the adjective from 'Pālatia' (Mart. IX. 24. 1). 'Dāphne' is usual, but Petronius (131) has 'Dāphne.' 'Romulēus' is usual, but we have 'Romulēus' in *Pervig.* *Ven.* 74 (see my note and Clementi). Persius (3. 9; so Auson. *Epigr.* 5. 9) has 'rūdere,' though the *u* is elsewhere short. Lucretius (IV. 641) has 'cōturnix,' Juvenal 'cōturnix' (xii. 97). 'Propino,' has the initial *o* both short (Juv. V. 27, Mart. II. 15. 1) in which case it is a Grecism, and long (Mart. I. 68. 3). Martial even has 'sēlibra' (I. 99. 15; V. 19. 11). This same cause enabled Manilius and Juvenal to shorten the penultimate of 'fortuitus,' which is long in Horace (*Carm.* II. 15. 17): Manil. I. 182 'nam neque fortuitos ortus

surgentibus astris.' Juv. xiii. 225 'non quasi fortuitus nec uentorum rabie sed': so probably Petron. 135 'fortuitoque luto.' For in neither case can the word be scanned by synizesis, since this is never employed by Manilius or Juvenal (L. Müller, *de re metr.* ed. 2, p. 302). In Hor. *Sat.* II. 2. 76, *Ep.* I. 1. 108 'pituita' is probably not a case of synizesis, but should be scanned *pītūita*; just as Statius (*S. I.* 6. 16) has 'gratuītus,' though 'gratuītus' is the proper quantity (Plaut. *Cist.* 740). These words had apparently two pronunciations: (1) -ūitus, the literary form; (2) ūitus, the popular form. Further, in the Empire the diphthong ūi became, at least in poetry, ūī (e.g. cūī, a pyrrhic).

These being the facts I retain with confidence in the text of Juvenal 'Venūsinam' in vi. 167, though Venūsia' is usual; 'equitesque Bīthyni' in vii. 15, though 'Bīthynus,' is usual; 'Thrāsychi' in vii. 204, though 'Thrāsychus' is usual; 'ficēdulas' in xiv. 9, though 'ficēdula' is usual. Emendation is required in no case, neither Bücheler's 'Venustinam,' though this is confirmed by the Valenciennes MS. (*Class. Q.* VI. 31), nor Bücheler's 'faciantque equites Bithyni,' accepted by Leo, nor Ritschl's 'Tharsymachi' accepted by Leo, though he does not mention Ritschl, nor Lachmann's 'ficellas' (Lucret. III. 992).

As to the construction in Ovid *Trist.* III. 12. 2, 'frigora minuit' must be supplied as complement to the subject 'Maeotis hiems' from 'frigora minuunt' line 1. The ellipsis is parallel to III. 3. 21 discussed above.

IV. 10. 79-80.

non aliter fleui, quam me fleturus ademptum
ille fuit. matris proxima busta tuli.

So most MSS., which reading I restored to the text in my edition. Most editors read 'matri (V) proxima iusta (Cujacius) tuli': wrongly, I think. Vogel, who approves my restoration, aptly quotes Stat. *Silu.* V. 1. 221 'nec enim fumantia busta clamoremque rogi potuit perferre.' The meaning is 'the next obsequies which I endured were my mother's.' This rare sense of *busta* 'the burnt remains' is found also in Stat. *Theb.* XII. 246 'haud procul Ogygias . . . domos et egena sepulcri busta iacere reor.' Lucan VIII. 849 'transibis in urbem, Magne, tuam, summusque feret tua busta sacerdos.'

V. 1. 69-72.

'at mala sunt.' fateor. quis te mala sumere cogit?
aut quis deceptum ponere sumpta uetat?
ipse nec emendo, sed ut hic deducta legantur;
non sunt illa suo barbariora loco.

So the passage should be read with the best MSS. Ovid is arguing with his critical reader, who found fault with the *Tristia* on account of its doleful

character. It is right (replies Ovid) that one who is sad-hearted should express his sadness. 'But (the critical reader then objects) your *Tristia* are poor stuff (*mala*).' 'I admit it (says Ovid). Who compels you to take them up if they are poor stuff? or who forbids you to lay them aside after taking them up, if you are disappointed? I do not even myself revise them. But you should read them with the thought before you that they were composed here in Tomi; they are not more unpolished than the place of their origin.'

When *nec* is seen to be equivalent to *ne quidem* as in *Pont.* I. 1. 19, *A.A.* III. 108, *legantur* construed as a jussive subjunctive, and *ut* taken as standing for *uelut*, this disputed passage becomes intelligible. For this use of *ut* see *Her.* 9. 129 'dat uultum populo sublimis ut Hercule uicto' (where see Palmer); *M.* 1. 585 'natamque miserrimus Io luget ut amissam'; *Hor. Carm.* III. 5. 42 'ut capitis minor.'

Editors usually accept the reading of the inferior MSS. 'ipse nec hoc mando.' This is evidently an interpolation to simplify the construction of *ut legantur*, which words its author took to depend on *mando*. Those who keep this reading suppose it to mean 'mando hoc i.e. ut sumas carmina siue deceptus sumpta ponas,' which is intricate.

V. 10. 41-42.

utque fit, in me aliquid siquidem dicentibus illis
abnuerim quotiens annuerimque putant.

siquidem is found in GHPV: the rest of the MSS. have *siquid*, of which *siquidem* is a corruption. L here fails. Various alterations have been proposed, the best is that of Ellis (*Hermathena*, VII. 210) 'in se aliquid fingi.' Schenkl before him had proposed *se*, but I do not think *me* should be altered. The *d* of *siquid* is probably due to dittography, coming from the succeeding *dicentibus*. Thus *siqui* was in the archetype. I think sense is best restored if we read *ficti*:

utque fit, in me aliquid ficti, dicentibus illis
abnuerim quotiens annuerimque, putant.

Ovid is speaking of the inability of the Getae to understand Latin; he must converse with them by signs. 'And, as often happens, whenever I nod dissent or agreement, they think that there is some deceit in me.' *Fictum* means something made up, untrue. *M.* IX. 768 'sed iam consumpserat omnem materiam ficti'; XII. 57 'mensuraque ficti crescit.'

V. 12. 11.

des licet in ualido pectus mihi robore fultum.

As *fultus* elsewhere, e.g. V. 13. 8, takes a simple ablative, Heinsius altered *in* to *hic*, i.e. 'hic apud Getas'; and in the *Corpus Poetarum* I read *en*. But I am now convinced that *in* is right. The same variation on the simple ablative

construction is found with *nitor* in Lucretius V. 909 'nexus in hoc uno nouitatis nomine inani.' Instances from Cicero are given by Kühner, *L. Gr.* ii. 293.

V. 12. 49-50.

nil mihi debebat cum uersibus amplius esse,
cum fugerem merito naufragus omne fretum.

For *cum* Heinsius introduced *sed* from a few inferior MSS. In the *Corpus* I printed *quin*, the conjecture of Dr. Postgate. I now think that *cum* should not be altered. The meaning is 'I ought to have had no more dealings with poetry since, having been deservedly shipwrecked, I should have entirely avoided the sea.' The language is metaphorical; the *Ars Amatoria* wrecked his fortunes and so he should embark no more upon the sea of poetry.

S. G. OWEN.

the *Corpus*
cum should
dealings with
ve entirely
via wrecked
ry.

G. OWEN.

THE GRAMMATICAL CHAPTERS IN QUINTILIAN I. 4-8.

I.

THE five chapters which Quintilian has devoted to 'Grammatica' are in many ways the most valuable discussion of the subject which we possess. They are older than any other surviving account, except the remains of Varro *De lingua Latina* and the grammar of Dionysius Thrax, and this last, though far more complete than Quintilian in its examination of the parts of speech, has nothing that compares with the other chapters on analogy, etymology, etc., nor does it give so clear a view of 'grammatica' as a whole. These chapters do not appear to have been treated by any scholar since Nettleship published his article on 'Latin Grammar in the First Century' in the *Journal of Philology*, vol. xv.¹ If, in the course of this paper, I traverse on certain points the opinions of so distinguished a scholar, let it be understood that I do so with much diffidence, and only after much consideration of the facts as they appear to me.

Quintilian divides 'grammatica' into two parts, 'recte loquendi scientia,' and 'enarratio poetarum' (i. 4, 2). The former, he tells us afterwards (i. 9, 1), is sometimes called 'methodice,' and the latter 'historice.' Here we have, of course, the distinction so familiar to ourselves between 'grammar' and 'literature.' The first question which I propose to examine in this paper is the history of this distinction.

'Grammar,' in our sense of the word, was no doubt in a way from the first an element in *γραμματική*. Though first developed as a part of *λογική* in the philosophical schools, the results there obtained were taken over and further developed by the Alexandrian Grammarians from the time of Aristophanes of Byzantium. That recognized 'grammatici' of various periods such as Aristarchus, Dionysius Thrax, Nigidius Figulus, or Valerius Cato wrote on what we call 'grammar,' is a fact the evidence for which can be found in any handbook to Greek or Roman literature. On the other hand, it is clear that the earlier conceptions of 'grammatica' do not contain any clear or sharp distinction between grammar and literature, such as we find in Quintilian. This appears both from formal definitions, as well as from general descriptions. Thus Cicero (*de Oratore*, i. 187) says, 'in grammaticis poetarum pertractatio,

¹ Afterwards reprinted in *Lectures and Essays* is given throughout. (Oxford, 1895), to the pages of which reference

historiarum cognitio, uerborum interpretatio, pronuntiandi quidam sonus.' Philo, who has a great many references to the grammarians, always regards the study as literary. 'Grammaticae' teaches us the *ἱστορίαι παρὰ ποιηταῖς καὶ συγγραφεῦσι*.¹ It *ἐντρέφεται παλαιαῖς καὶ ὠνυγίοις δόξαις*;² it enables us *ἀρχαίαν ἀκοὴν ἔργων καλῶν μεταδιώκειν, ἅπερ ἱστορικοὶ καὶ σύμπαν τὸ ποιητικὸν γένος παραδεδώκασι*;³ although elsewhere⁴ it is pointed out that the *γραμματικός* borrows the explanation of the parts of speech and the nature of words from philosophy. But the short treatise of Dionysius Thrax shows us most clearly the relation which 'grammar' is conceived of as bearing to *γραμματική*. The book really deals entirely with 'grammar,' but it opens with a definition of *γραμματική* and its constituent elements which is almost entirely literary. *γραμματική* itself is defined as *ἐμπειρία τῶν παρὰ ποιηταῖς τε καὶ συγγραφεῦσι ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ λεγομένων*. This is followed by the enumeration of its six *μέρη*: (1) *ἀνάγνωσις*; (2) *ἐξήγησις κατὰ τρόπους*; (3) *ἀπόδοσις γλωσσῶν καὶ ἱστορίων*; (4) *εὗρεσις ἐτυμολογίας*; (5) *ἀναλογίας ἐκλογισμός*; (6) *κρίσις*. Of these the fifth, and possibly the fourth, are grammatical, but it is clear that the exposition of the parts of speech, etc., into which Dionysius plunges at once, has nothing to do with these, but is intended to serve as an introduction to *ἀνάγνωσις*. The doctrine evidently is that if we are to read properly and intelligently the things contained in the 'poets and prose-writers,' we must first understand the words of which they are composed. In fact, 'grammar' stands to *γραμματική* in much the same relation as the axioms, definitions and postulates of Euclid stand to geometry, a comparison which in fact is actually made by Philo.⁵

It is interesting to compare with Dionysius the views of Varro so far as we know them. Varro defines 'grammatica' itself in exactly the same terms,⁶ but instead of the six *μέρη* of Dionysius we have four 'officia'—viz., 'lectio,' 'emendatio,' 'enarratio,' 'iudicium.'⁷ I shall compare these two systems later; here I will merely point out that all four belong to literature and not to grammar. For though 'emendatio' is defined by Diomedes as 'reorrectio errorum, qui per dictionem⁸ uel per scripturam fiunt,' a definition which would seem to correspond to the 'recte loquendi et scribendi regula' of Quintilian, he is probably mistaken in this. Varro's definition of the four *officia* is merely a translation of the Greek *διόρθωσις, ἀνάγνωσις, ἐξήγησις, κρίσις*, which are declared by the scholiasts on Dionysius to be *τὰ πάλαι μέρη τῆς γραμματικῆς*, though they give them in varying order. When we remember that *διόρθωσις* is the accepted term for correction of the text, there can, I think, be little doubt that the arrangement in which *διόρθωσις* comes first gives the right order, and

¹ *De Congressu*, 4.

² *De Sac. Ab.*, 22.

³ *ib.*

⁴ *De Congressu*, 26.

⁵ *ib.*

⁶ Marius Victorinus K., vol. vi., p. 4. He adds 'eius praecipua officia sunt quattuor, ut ipsi placet, scribere, legere, intellegere, probare.'

This classification is discussed further on, p. 13. Probably *scribere, legere*, refer to the school of the *γραμματιστής* (so Wilmanns), the other two to the school of the *γραμματικός*, and all four contemplate the work of the pupil, while the other classification thinks of the teacher.

⁷ Ap. Diomedes, K. vol i., p. 426.

⁸ Wilmanns proposed *dictationem* for *dictionem*.

that a fairly correct explanation of the term is given by the scholiast who says *πρὸ τοῦ ἄρξασθαι τὸν νέον ἀναγιγνώσκειν, ὃ διορθωτῆς λαμβάνων τὸ βιβλίον διωρθοῦτο αὐτό.*¹

On the whole, then, it would appear that 'grammar' made its way into 'grammatica' in an informal manner, as a necessary part of the equipment of the 'grammaticus,' but not as a separate branch or department. But at the same time it is probably true that from early times such a doctrine as Quintilian's was occasionally held. The idea of 'Ἑλληνισμός' is as old as Aristotle, and the view that it is the first *ἀρετή* of speech appears in the account of the Stoic system given by Diogenes Laertius (vii. 1. 40). In the face of the growing decay, or what seemed to be decay, of the language it was inevitable that an idea should spring up that the function of *γραμματική* was to preserve the laws of correct speech as well as to preserve the knowledge and understanding of the classical writers. Indeed, if we may trust a late authority, an early definition was given in something like this sense. Marius Victorinus says, 'ut Aristoni placet, grammaticæ est scientia poetarum et historicorum intelligendi, formam præcipue loquendi ad rationem et consuetudinem dirigens.'² If this Ariston is the same as the Ariston whose definition of rhetoric is given by Quintilian (ii. 15, 19), he belongs presumably to the second century B.C. But though this is a step towards Quintilian's doctrine, it is not quite the same. 'Grammatica,' it is true, has both the functions which Quintilian ascribes to it, but we have not arrived at the idea of two separate bodies of knowledge each with distinct functions.

Two other considerations doubtless contributed to foster the conception of 'grammar' as a science by itself. In the first place the bulk of the subject grew immensely, and what in 150 B.C. might very well pass as a mere introduction to the study of literature, had by A.D. 50, or earlier, entirely outgrown such a conception. Seneca indeed³ seems to suggest that the 'grammaticus' might often find it necessary to confine himself to 'cura sermonis.'³ In the second place there was a growing feeling that the two subjects differed altogether in nature. The first was capable of being reduced to an ordered system; the second was essentially a mass of disconnected facts.⁴ Thus, says Quintilian, 'illam methodicè, hanc historicè uocant.' At what date exactly this recognition of 'grammar' as distinct from 'literature' became thoroughly established, it is, I imagine, impossible to say. All we can tell is that it must be dated somewhere between Dionysius Thrax and Quintilian. It may be added that to judge from the discussion of the subject in Sextus Empiricus, the justice of the distinction was not questioned in later times.

Professor Nettleship (*Essay*, p. 166) says 'to Varro "grammatica" included "lectio," "enarratio," "emendatio," and "iudicium." To Quintilian it is no more than "recte loquendi scientia," and "poetarum enarratio." The school-

¹ *Gram. Græc.*, vol. iii., p. 12.

² K. (vol. vi., p. 4).

³ Sen. *Ep.* 88, 3.

⁴ ἀμέθοδος ὅλη, Sext. Emp. *Adv. Gram.* 249. In Diomedes and elsewhere, the two are classed as ὁριστική and ἐξηγητική.

master has driven the philosopher away, or put him into the background.' Whether the antithesis between 'philosopher' and 'schoolmaster' is a sound one, or what there is especially philosophic in the Varronian classification, I will not stop to inquire. But the suggestion that the distinction the history of which I have been endeavouring to trace comes from the 'schoolmaster' is a point which deserves a little discussion. That the history of 'grammatica' has in some ways been influenced by pedagogic considerations—considerations, that is, of what is easy and convenient for the teacher to teach, rather than of the natural order and real value of the things studied, is, I think, the truth. But the present case is not a case in point. The three considerations I have pointed out—(1) the supposed importance of preserving 'Ἑλληνισμός; (2) the rapid growth of scientific grammar; (3) the intrinsic difference of what can be treated μεθοδικῶς, and what is ἀμέθοδος, are matters which do not belong to the class-room but to the general trend of thought.

II.

I now pass to Quintilian's treatment of the 'recte loquendi scientia,' which occupies chapters iv. to vi., and is followed by a chapter on the 'recte scribendi regula' or orthography. This last chapter presents no special difficulties, but the scheme of chapters iv. to vi. is apparently very perplexed, and I cannot give the impression they produce at first sight better than by quoting Nettleship's description: 'That part of the first book which begins i. 4. 1, and ends i. 5. 54, contains in an abridged form much of what might well have been found in an *Ars Grammatica*; i. 4 §§ 2-17 treats of letters, §§ 18-21 of the parts of speech, §§ 22-25 of nouns and cases, §§ 26-29 of the verb; i. 5 §§ 5-33 of 'barbarisms,' §§ 34-54 of 'soloecismus'; and at this point Quintilian bids adieu to grammar. He then proceeds to consider the question of words—provincial, Gallic, Spanish, and Greek, simple and compound, literal and metaphorical. Thus the fifth chapter ends, and the sixth is a dissertation on *sermo* or usage, considered under four heads, that of *ratio* or reason, including *analogia* and *etymologia*, antiquity, authority, and custom.¹ This is, as I have said, a fair description of what appears at first sight, but the writer, I believe, has not observed the connecting-links, and the conclusions he bases on it seem to me erroneous. Assuming 'as almost certain that Quintilian had some technical treatise before him the rules of which he throws into literary form,' Nettleship proceeds to argue that iv. 1 to v. 54 comes from Palaemon,² and v. 55 to vi. 27 from Pliny. This assumption seems to me very far from certain. The points in

¹ *Essay*, pp. 165, 159.

² But as chapter vii. is supposed by Nettleship to be 'taken or adapted' from Verrius, while iv. 6-17 exhibits the same characteristics as vii., the theory has to be complicated by supposing that Palaemon borrowed these sections from Verrius. As a matter of fact the resemblances between Quintilian and Paulus' epitome of

Verrius show, I think, that Quintilian knew and used Verrius, but the introduction of Palaemon is pure hypothesis, at any rate in these sections. It is to be noted that some of the most noteworthy coincidences between Quintilian and Paulus occur in chapter vi., which Nettleship does not ascribe to Verrius.

which Nettleship traces a correspondence between Quintilian on the one hand, and Palaemon and Pliny¹ on the other, appear to me most precarious, and even if they are sound they go very little way to show direct borrowing. Grammar was at that time a progressive science: each writer built upon the foundation of his predecessors, sometimes affirming, sometimes denying. Quintilian, no doubt, read and weighed his authorities. He actually quotes Caesar, Messalla, Asconius, and 'nostri praeceptores.' Many people seem to have a poorer opinion than I have of Quintilian's ability. He may, as Rutherford says, 'have read more than he can carry,' but no one, I should have thought, could have failed to see that he always tried to think out things for himself. As to Palaemon, while it is true that the scholiast on Iuu. 6. 451 says that Quintilian had been his pupil, and that in that case he probably owes much to him, it should be noted that in the one passage from the part supposed to be adapted from Palaemon, in which he mentions that writer's name, he says that 'some authorities give nine parts of speech, but Aristarchus and in our own times Palaemon gave eight, as they did not distinguish the noun from the appellation, but whether this is right or not, as it matters little, I leave an open question.' To suppose that this is a transcript from Palaemon seems somewhat perverse.

But Nettleship's view involves a more serious charge against Quintilian. He is charged with having dovetailed Palaemon on grammar into Pliny on 'sermo' without any attempt at coherence or arrangement. This is entirely contrary to Quintilian's habit, and it is a supposition which should only be adopted as a last resource. I believe the chapters, if read properly, show a very clear and coherent scheme.

Quintilian begins with some remarks on the parts of speech and their subdivisions, and of this chapter Nettleship's analysis may be accepted; but it should be observed that there is no attempt to give any detailed account like that of Dionysius Thrax, but merely to note a few points which either are frequently neglected or present special interest. Thus he dwells at some length on the eight (or nine) parts of speech, because so many different opinions were held on them. The importance of declining nouns and verbs is mentioned because so many teachers neglect it. Such questions as whether the ablative should be distinguished from the instrumental or the impersonal passive from the ordinary passive are noted. The whole of this chapter, in fact, is largely directed to meet the objection that grammar is 'tenuis et ieiuna,' and to show that in this introductory branch many difficult and interesting *quaestiones* arise.

¹ He brings forward three points in which Quintilian discusses or mentions questions known to have been discussed by Pliny; (a) declension of Greek nouns in -o; (b) the coincidence in gender of the diminutive with the principal noun; (c) the two forms *Albanus* and *Albensis* from *Alba*. Of these (a) had been discussed by Caesar, and Pliny and Quintilian both dis-

agreed with him; (b) Pliny is stated to have followed Varro; (c) is mentioned by Varro, *L.L.* viii. 35. All three were stock cases. Two other points are mentioned which Nettleship thinks may have been quoted by Charisius from Pliny. One of them, at any rate, is in Varro, the other, or a similar one, had been discussed both by Pliny and Caesar.

When this work of classification and definition has been disposed of (so Quintilian continues in chapter v.), the principles of 'emendate' or 'recte loquendi' may be approached. These apply (1) to 'singula uerba'; (2) to 'plura uerba.' 'Singula uerba' may be classified as (a) native or foreign; (b) single or compound; (c) literal or metaphorical; (d) in common use or made up (*usitata aut ficta*).¹ It is in choosing between the two classes in each pair that the 'regula recte loquendi,' so far as 'singula uerba' are concerned, chiefly acts. But before we deal with these we must dispose of actually wrong or impossible words, (1) 'barbarismi,' which belong to 'uerba singula'; (2) 'soloeismi,' which belong to 'plura uerba.' We accordingly deal with these. But barbarisms and solecisms are mere deformities (*foeditas*); the normal application of the 'regula recte loquendi' lies rather in the choice of words which are more or less *dubia*.² We therefore now return to our main subject,³ and say something about the lines to be followed in choosing 'singula uerba' as classified above.⁴

Having done this we should naturally proceed to deal with the 'regula recte loquendi pluribus uerbis.' Instead of this we have the dissertation on 'sermo' of Chapter vi. The solution of this difficulty lies, I believe, in supposing that 'sermo' is simply the same as 'plura uerba.' That Quintilian frequently uses 'sermo' as a contrast to single words may be shown by the following, (i. 1, 31) 'syllabis uerba complecti et his sermonem connectere,' (i. 5, 2) 'omnia (i.e. uerba) per quae sermo nectitur,' (i. 5, 34, of the solecism) 'in uerbo esse uitium non in sermone contendunt,' (viii. 6, 1) 'tropus est uerbi uel sermonis . . . mutatio.' It is not perhaps so easy to see how the examples which Quintilian treats in his discourse on 'sermo' fall under the head of 'plura uerba.' Why, for instance, should the question of *domu* or *domo* (i. 6, 5) or of *audacter* or *audaciter* be matters of 'plura uerba' any more than the choice of *raeda* (i. 5, 57) (instead of some native Latin word), which is classed as 'unius uerbi'? The answer is, I think, that chapter vi. deals with formations or 'declinatio,' a term used very widely to describe not merely inflections, but derivatives, and that every such 'declinatum' is considered in relation to the word from which it is formed, and therefore raises a question not of 'unum uerbum' but of 'plura uerba.' This view that 'sermo' (in chapter vi.) = 'declinata' = 'plura uerba' = 'formations' seems to be confirmed by i. 5, 16. Here Quintilian says that as 'barbarismi' applies to single words, it may perhaps seem absurd to apply the term to cases where the erroneous form involves an error in a number or gender. He instances amongst others

¹ Elsewhere called 'noua.'

² 'Arte non egent, cuius in hoc opere non est usus nisi in *dubis*,' i. 6, 38; 'analogiae haec uis est, ut id, quod *dubium* est, ad aliquid simile de quo non quaeritur referat,' i. 6, 3.

³ 'hoc amplius ut institutum ordinem sequar.' These are the words with which, on Nettleship's theory, Quintilian 'having bid adieu to Grammar' (and Palaemon) proceeds to make a literary

transcript of Pliny! No more unlikely place can be imagined for such a complete break.

⁴ One of the four pairs 'translata' and 'propria' is passed over with a bare mention and no examples. Quintilian, no doubt, felt that it belonged rather to rhetoric—i.e., it was not so much a question 'recte loquendi,' as 'bene dicendi.'

gladia for *gladius*. He himself apparently regards this as an error 'unius uerbi,' for let *gladia* once be postulated, *gladium*, *gladiae* follow normally, and are not really erroneous, but he is aware that the 'prima facie' view is that all these forms in *-a* are erroneous, and therefore are not 'unius uerbi.'

Assuming then that this chapter gives us the 'regula recte loquendi in pluribus uerbis,' what is this 'regula'? I understand it as follows. The 'declinatio' of words is naturally and normally determined by 'ratio,' i.e. by 'analogia' and 'etymologia.' Thus by 'analogia' we should expect *domus*, *domūs*, *domu*; *senatus*, *senatūs*, *senatu*; *ferueo*, *feruet*: while by 'etymologia' we should expect *medius* to produce *medidiem*. The forces which militate against this natural tendency are 'uetustas,' 'auctoritas,' 'consuetudo.' Thus 'uetustas' might be pleaded to justify *senati*, the 'auctoritas' of Lucilius for *feruit*, while 'consuetudo' declares for *domo* and perhaps for *meridiem*. It is true that in developing these heads Quintilian does not always confine himself to examples of 'declinatio.'¹ The question, for instance, of the correctness of *topper* is really a question 'unius uerbi.' But I do not think this is any objection to the view of 'sermo' and of this chapter taken above. The four forces 'ratio,' 'uetustas,' 'auctoritas,' 'consuetudo' work principally in the sphere of 'plura uerba,' but they also work elsewhere. It is not very remarkable that Quintilian having introduced these four heads should discourse at large upon them, without confining himself strictly to the subject in connection with which he introduced them. This may convict him to a certain extent of irrelevance, but irrelevance is a different thing from incoherence, of which under any other view of 'sermo' as used in this chapter, he must, I think, stand convicted.

With regard to these four heads, Nettleship,² who holds (I think on quite insufficient grounds) that they come from Pliny, contrasts them with Varro's 'natura,' 'analogia,' 'consuetudo,' 'auctoritas,' as reported in Diomedes (K. 1, 433). What Diomedes actually says is:

'Latinitas est incorrupta loquendi obseruatio, secundum Romanam linguam. constat autem, ut asserit Varro, his quatuor, natura, analogia, consuetudine, auctoritate. natura uerborum nominumque immutabilis est, nec quicquam aut minus aut plus tradidit nobis, quam quod accipit. nam si quis dicit *scrimbo* quod est *scribo*, non analogiae uirtute, sed natura ipsius constitutionis conuincitur.'³

Now passing over the point that Varro is stated to be discussing 'Latinitas' not 'sermo,' we may ask, Are the second and third sentences intended to give us Varro's view of 'natura'? If so, it corresponds exactly to Quintilian's

¹ The fact is that it is very difficult to keep the two apart. Thus in v. 55 etc., the question of the choice between Greek and Latin words, which is a matter of 'singula uerba,' inevitably leads to a discussion of Greek declension as opposed to Latin declension in names like *Calypso*, which, as a matter of formation, really

belongs to 'plura uerba.'

² *Essay*, p. 161.

³ In Charisius (K. 1, 50) the same statement with the same explanation of 'natura' and the same example of *scrimbo* is given of 'sermo,' but here it is not ascribed to Varro.

'singula uerba.' *Scrimbo* is a 'barbarismus.' We decide between *scrimbo* and *scribo* without reference to any other word. On this view of 'natura' Quintilian, in deciding the principles on which his 'sermo' depends, would be bound to eliminate it, and his division is really much the same as Varro's, or at least merely exhibits the development which might be expected during the time that elapsed between the two writers. I find it difficult, however, to bring Diomedes' explanation into harmony with the ninth book of the *De Lingua Latina*. There Varro clearly identifies 'natura' with 'analogia.' If we follow analogy we follow nature: if we allow 'consuetudo' to override it we go against nature. I am inclined on the whole to believe that what Varro really said was 'natura, siue analogia.' On either view, however, Quintilian will be brought into substantial agreement with Varro.

The scheme then of chapters iv.-vii. in my view is as follows. The subject of the whole is 'recte loquendi et scribendi scientia':

Chapter iv. The grammarian must observe and classify the facts of the language.

Chapter v. He must then apply this knowledge practically to establish the 'regula recte loquendi' (a) in singulis uerbis, (b) in pluribus uerbis.

(a 1) He will eliminate actual mistakes 'in singulis uerbis' (*barbarismus*).

(b 1) He will do the same 'in pluribus uerbis' (*soloecismus*).

(a 2) He will deal with 'dubia' (i.e. with questions where there is fair room for discussion) 'in singulis uerbis.' Here the choice will be chiefly between (a) native and foreign words, (β) compounded and uncompounded, (γ) literal and metaphorical, (δ) familiar and new.

Chapter vi. (b 2). He will deal with 'dubia' 'in pluribus uerbis.' Here his choice will lie between the conflicting claims of 'analogia' and 'etymologia' on the one hand, and 'uetustas,' 'auctoritas,' and 'consuetudo' on the other.

It is to be understood that both in a 2 and b 2 the final choice must depend on the 'iudicium' of the grammaticus.¹

The subject is concluded by some remarks on the 'regula scribendi recte,' Chapter vii. discussing various 'dubious' cases, and deciding that the general rule must be to adhere as closely as possible to the sound of the word unless 'consuetudo' decides otherwise. Thus the chapters form an organic whole, though they do not attempt to give a complete 'Ars,' but merely to sketch the principles on which the 'recte loquendi et scribendi scientia' should be taught. They do not pretend to originality, but it is impossible to say on what authorities the writer relies, and for the theory that one part of them is drawn from one author, and another from another, there is no evidence whatever.

[The words 'est etiam sua loquentibus obseruatio, sua scribentibus' at the beginning of Chapter vi. may seem to be against my view of the connection of that chapter. They look as if a new departure were now taken, and we were entering upon the question of spoken language in general, as opposed to questions of mere spelling, which are to be dealt with in Chapter vii. I am

¹ i. 6, 3 'omnia (i.e. analogia, etc.) exigunt acre iudicium.'

inclined to think that these words really belong to Chapter v., and refer to the subject with which that chapter closes—viz. 'onomatopoeic words.' Quintilian does not here (though no doubt he does elsewhere) contrast 'loqui' with 'scribere' in the sense of words as they sound opposed to words as they are spelt, but in the sense of conversational language opposed to the more formal written language. Many onomatopoeic formations, he means, may sound all right in conversation, but you would hardly venture to use them in writing. We should probably say the same of slang in general.]

III.

I now turn to the consideration of the literary side of 'grammatica,' that side which he describes in chapter iv. as 'enarratio poetarum,' and in chapter ix. as 'historice.' But before doing this it will be well to compare Dionysius' classification with the Varronian, which, as I have said, is not really Varro's, but taken over by him from the Greek schools. For convenience, however, I will continue to use the term 'Varronian.' We have:

| Dionysius. | Varronian. |
|--|------------|
| ἀνάγνωσις { καθ' ὑπόκρισιν | διόρθωσις |
| { κατὰ προσφθίαν | ἀνάγνωσις |
| { κατὰ διαστολήν | ἐξήγησις |
| ἐξήγησις κατὰ τοὺς ἐνυπάρχοντας ποιητικούς τρόπους | κρίσις |
| γλωσσῶν καὶ ἱστοριῶν ἀπόδοσις | |
| ἐτυμολογίας εὗρεσις | |
| ἀναλογίας ἐκλογισμός | |
| κρίσις ποιημάτων. | |

We may fairly assume that the 'Varronian' classification is the older, and we may note the following differences:

Firstly, *διόρθωσις* is absent in Dionysius' list, a phenomenon which we shall find recurring in Quintilian. I do not think we should infer from this that the grammarians in their capacity of scholars had ceased or were ceasing to pay attention to textual criticism. The history of the school of Aristarchus proves the opposite, and there are several passages in Quintilian¹ and other writers which testify to the attention paid to MSS. evidence. The omission is due to what may with justice be called a 'pedagogic' reason, though at the same time I believe a perfectly sound one. It was thought wisest to put into the hands of boys the best text and expound that, without troubling them with various readings, a view in which probably most schoolmasters to-day would concur. Rutherford remarks on the paucity of textual notes in the scholia on Aristophanes.²

Secondly, the vague term *ἐξήγησις* has been developed into (1) *ἐξήγησις*

¹ Useful examples are given in Lehr's *Aristarchus*, p. 344.

² *A Chapter in the History of Annotation*, chapter 1.

κατὰ τοὺς ἐνυπάρχοντας ποιητικοὺς τρόπους, (2) γλωσσῶν καὶ ἱστοριῶν πρόχειρος ἀπόδοσις. This brings us to the very heart of the ancient theory of teaching literature. The underlying doctrine I take to be this: Obscurity, which it is the purpose of ἐξήγησις to remove, arises in poetry from three causes: (1) The use of uncommon or obsolete words (γλῶσσαι), (2) allusions to facts unknown to the reader (ἱστορίαι), (3) the presence of 'tropes,' i.e. 'sermones a naturali et principali significatione translati,' or 'figures,' i.e. 'conformationes quaedam orationis remotae a communi.'¹ To explain the γλῶσσαι and ἱστορίαι all that is needed is that the grammarian should know and state each point as it arises.² The difficulties that still remain must be solved by giving the student a knowledge of the possible tropes and figures, and training him to trace each case to its particular lair. Beyond these no further ἐξήγησις is required. If we had not so completely lost the science of tropes and figures, we might possibly find that this doctrine, though far from being absolutely true, contains a considerable element of truth. At any rate, I am sure that a certain amount of ἐξήγησις κατὰ τρόπους would be found by teachers of English Literature to impart both interest and method to their lessons.

Thirdly, while the science of grammar, generally speaking, is not reckoned by Dionysius as a separate branch of the subject, but rather as an introduction, the grammatical treatment of the books is to some extent acknowledged under the heads of parsing (ἀναλογίας ἐκλογισμός) and etymology. This classification does not seem to have held its ground, in spite of the great authority of Dionysius, to judge from Sextus Empiricus,³ who says that Dionysius ἀτόπως διαιρεῖται, accuses him of raising to the position of μέρη what are really μόρια and ἀποτελέσματα, and does not seem to have found the classification in any other authority.

Now to turn to Quintilian, though his terminology has a certain inconsistency, his general principles are clear. In Chapters iv. and ix. he speaks of the whole literary department as 'enarratio poetarum,' but in the first of these he hastens to add 'enarrationem praecedat emendata lectio.' In chapter viii., where he deals with the subject in detail, he divides the course of instruction into (1) 'lectio,' (2) 'praelectio' (in praelegendo grammaticus debebit, etc.), and (3) 'enarratio historiarum.' With regard to the first of these, while his account is more discursive and less business-like than that of Dionysius, it covers practically the same ground.

Thus 8, § 1:

ubi suspendere spiritum debeat, quo loco uersum = Dionysius' ἀνάγνωσις
distinguere, ubi claudatur sensus, unde in- κατὰ διαστολήν
cipiat, quando attollenda uel submittenda

¹ Quintilian ix. 1, 4.

² For this reason perhaps the curious epithet πρόχειρος is attached to γλωσσῶν καὶ ἱστοριῶν ἀπόδοσις. With them the teacher has merely to state the facts; with the ἐξήγησις κατὰ τρόπους, a

more 'heuristic' method has to be adopted, Cf. Sext. Emp. *Adv. Gram.*, 249, ἱστορικὸν δὲ τὸ περὶ τὴν προχειρότητα τῆς ἀμεθόδου ὕλης.

³ *Adv. Gram.*, 250.

sit uox, quo quidque flexu, quid lentius celerius, concitatus lenius dicendum.

§ 2:

sit autem in primis lectio uirilis et cum suauitate = κατὰ προσφδίαν
quadam grauis, et non quidem prosae similis
. . . non tamen in canticum dissoluta nec
plasmate . . . effeminata.

§ 3:

nec prosopopoeias . . . ad comicum morem pronuntiari uelim, esse tamen flexum quemdam, quo distinguantur ab iis in quibus poeta persona sua utetur.

It may be noted here that Quintilian with his usual incisive common-sense adds, 'unum est igitur quod in hac parte praecipiam: ut omnia ista facere possit, intelligat,' from which we may infer that the 'praelectio' was to some extent what its name implies. The teacher had first to explain sufficiently to make the general sense intelligible. Detailed comments no doubt followed the reading lesson.

When we come to the 'praelectio' the duties of the grammaticus are stated thus:

1. He must make his pupil give:

- (a) The 'partes orationis' (ἀναλογίας ἐκλογισμός),
- (b) The 'pedum proprietates'—i.e. scan.

2. Point out 'barbara et impropria, quae contra leges loquendi sint posita.'
3. Show the various senses in which words are used—i.e. homonyms.
4. Explain 'glossemata' or 'uoces minus usitatas' (γλωσσῶν ἀπόδοσις.)
5. Show tropes and figures (ἐξήγησις κατὰ τρόπους). This is to be done 'maiore cura.'

And then follows this sentence:

Praecipue uero illa infigat animis, quae in oeconomia uirtus, quae in decore rerum, quid personae cuique conueniat, quid in sensibus laudandum, quid in uerbis, ubi copia probabilis, ubi modus.

That is, he will group his criticisms of the poem under the following heads:

- (a) Structure.
- (b) Appropriateness and beauty of the incidents.
- (c) Characterization.
- (d) Notable thoughts.
- (e) Beauty of diction.
- (f) Criticism of the style (at least from the point of view of fullness or brevity).

This passage, which I venture to think contains much useful instruction for those who essay the difficult task of teaching English Literature, corresponds I believe to the Dionysian κρίσις, ὃ κάλλιστόν ἐστι μέρος τῆς τέχνης. Finally there comes, with a somewhat depreciatory paragraph to itself, the 'enarratio historiarum.'

When we compare this sketch with the scheme of Dionysius we see that while the general principles remain the same, there are some important differences. The grammatical element has come much more to the front. To the bare parsing or ἀναλογίας ἐκλογισμός is added scansion and the noting of 'barbara et impropria uerba,' and the study of 'homonyms.' This, of course, was bound to be the consequence of the elevation of the 'loquendi regula' into one half of the whole 'grammatica.' The 'grammaticus' might and did, no doubt, lecture separately on the 'loquendi regula,'¹ but he was also sure to use the literary 'praelectio' as a means of enforcing and illustrating the rules which he had expounded. Why ἐτυμολογίας εὑρεσις finds no place in Quintilian's scheme it is difficult to say. He has already discussed the value of etymology as a criterion of correct language, and though he thought much of the current work in the subject fanciful and ridiculous, he can hardly have intended to exclude it from the 'praelection.' The omission is, perhaps, purely accidental.

I have suggested above that the passage 'praecipue—modus' i. 8, 17 corresponds to the Dionysian κρίσις, but this point requires some discussion. Rutherford² holds that Dionysius rather refers to the art by which the critic detects the spuriousness of lines, passages or words, and it is true enough, as he says, that this was the part of Aristarchus' work which attracted most notice in antiquity. It may be added that the scholiasts of Dionysius are unanimous in putting this interpretation upon the word, and further, perhaps, that Quintilian, in i. 4, 3,³ implies that one of the functions of 'iudicium' was to declare that passages or whole books were unworthy of the supposed author and therefore spurious, or that the author as a whole was unworthy of a place in the 'canon.' It seems to me indeed most probable that in the formula διόρθωσις, ἀνάγνωσις, ἐξηγήσις, κρίσις, the last term did originally bear this limited meaning. My reason for thinking that Dionysius uses it in a wider sense is that his purpose appears to be pedagogic, while the original formula thought of the 'grammaticus' rather as a scholar. Just as Dionysius omits διόρθωσις because textual emendation was not a suitable study for schoolboys, so I take it he may be expected to have held the view that before you lay down to boys that such and such passages are genuine or spurious you must teach them to appreciate their merits or demerits. In what sense Varro used 'iudicium' is also uncertain, but such evidence as we have seems

¹ Quintilian i. 2, 14.

² *A Chapter in the History of Annotation*, chapter vi.

³ 'et mixtum his omnibus iudicium est, quo quidem ita seuerè sunt usi ueteres grammatici,

ut non uersus modo censoria quadam uirgula notare et libros, qui falso uiderentur inscripti, tanquam subditos summouere familia permiserint sibi, sed auctores alios in ordinem redegerint alios omnino exemerint numero.'

to point to the wider meaning. In the first place, both Marius Victorinus and Diomedes explain the term as equal to 'bene dictorum comprobatio,' and, secondly, the other classification ascribed to Varro suggests that just as *intelligere* corresponds to 'enarratio,' so does *probare* to 'iudicium.'¹ The teacher *indicat*, i.e., notes the merits of the writer; the pupil *probat* the same.

Dionysius then having in view the requirements of the class-room, has, I think, widened the term *κρίσις*, originally suggesting the *sentence* pronounced by the 'grammaticus,' to include the *grounds of judgment* on which such sentences were formed, to mean in fact 'critical appreciations.' Quintilian goes a step further: he keeps the substance of the Dionysian *κρίσις*, but refuses to use the term (at least so I understand the passage i. 4, 3 quoted above) because he wants it for something else. His meaning is that 'iudicium' cannot be limited to any particular department of 'grammatica.' It must be remembered that Quintilian's most fundamental educational principle is the right and duty of private judgment,² that there are no such things in any department of learning as '*καθολικά* praecepta'—rules which are universally and invariably true. Thus in iii. 3, 5 and vi. 5, 1 he deprecates the view that 'iudicium' can be regarded as a special province in *rhetoric*, for it is inseparable from every part of the work, and cannot be made the subject of the rules of art, any more than taste or smell. And so too with 'grammatica,' the word 'iudicium' is wanted for the faculty of independent judgment, which is capable at any moment of overriding the dictates of general law and thinking for itself.

We have seen that Quintilian reserves to the end the 'enarratio historiarum'—the exposition, that is, of questions arising out of the subject-matter of the book or allusions contained therein.³

The best account of 'historiae' is to be found in Sextus Empiricus,⁴ making due allowance for his hostile bias. 'Histories' may be classified as true (historical in the limited sense), or fictitious though possible as in comedies (*πλάσματα*), or fabulous (*μῦθοι*). Or again they may be classified as dealing with places, dates, personages or actions. Some examples are given. 'Brileus is a mountain in Attica;' 'Acamas is a promontory in Cyprus.' 'Pelops' shoulder was of ivory, and was eaten by either Ares or Demeter.' 'Xenophanes was a Colophonian, and lived about the fortieth Olympiad.' 'Plato's name was Aristocles, and he wore earrings.' That information of this sort, which is frequently relevant and even necessary, should constantly tend to develop into laborious erudition is a necessity of human, or at any rate of a schoolmaster's, nature. The sarcastic references to this are of course very frequent. I need not do more than refer to Mayor's note on Juvenal vii. 234.

Seneca in a passage⁵ already quoted says 'grammaticus circa curam

¹ *Vide* note on p. 3.

² Quintilian ii. 13, 14.

³ Rutherford translates 'matters of fact.'

⁴ *Adv. Gram.* 250, and following sections.

⁵ *Ep.* 88, 3.

sermonis uersatur, et si latius euagari uult, circa historias, iam ut longissime fines suos proferat, circa carmina.' The natural meaning of this is that some grammarians taught 'historiae' without teaching anything else about 'carmina.' In other words, 'historiae' in Seneca's time were regarded as coming earlier in the literary curriculum than the other parts of 'enarratio poetarum.' Now it is no doubt possible that Seneca may be writing with the same dogmatic ignorance with which modern journalists and speakers often write and speak about school practice, but his words receive a strong confirmation from Sextus Empiricus. Sextus knows nothing of the Varronian classification, and only mentions the Dionysian to express his astonishment at it. With him the accepted classification is into *τεχνικόν, ἱστορικόν, ἰδιαιτέρον*.¹ This last is described thus: τὸ κατὰ τοὺς ποιητὰς καὶ συγγραφεῖς ἐπισκοποῦσι, καθ' ὃ τὰ ἀσαφῶς λεγόμενα ἐξηγούνται τὰ τε ὑγιή καὶ τὰ μὴ τοιαῦτα κρίνουσι, τὰ τε γνήσια ἀπὸ τῶν τοιούτων διορίζουσι. Sextus does not suggest as Seneca does that there were schools where τὸ ἰδιαιτέρον was not taught at all, but he does suggest that the latter was felt to be the more advanced, and that there was a clear dividing line between it and the 'historic' treatment. When Quintilian reserves his remarks on the 'enarratio historiarum' to the end he does not of course mean to reverse the order given by Seneca and Sextus.² He feels that the 'historiae' absorb so much time and attention that the question of their treatment demands special discussion, and he wishes to warn the teacher against exaggerating their importance.³

One other important difference between Quintilian and Dionysius remains to be noted. The latter includes prose writers (*συγγραφεῖς*) in the subject-matter of *γραμματική*, while in Quintilian, although prose composition of a sort is learnt from the grammarians, the study of prose-writers is entirely reserved for the rhetoric school. So far as I know, in all Roman writers the practising sphere of the grammarian is invariably limited to poetry, though the view that originally *γραμματική* included at any rate the historians is put forward by Quintilian himself in ii. 1, 4.⁴ What, then, led to their complete exclusion in later times from the Roman schools, if not from the Greek? I have no doubt that we must largely ascribe it to the Roman conviction that poetry is an essential element in the formation of national character, a con-

¹ *Adv. Gram.* 92, 93. I think this passage supports the view of *κρίσις* taken above. He seems to use *ὑγιής* in the sense of 'valuable,' 'morally sound.' I do not know whether *ὑγιής* is ever used of 'sound text.' Stephanus gives no examples of it.

² In i. 2. 14 he gives the same order as the others, 'grammaticus si de loquendi ratione disserat, si quaestiones explicet, historias exponat, poemata enarret.'

³ The view adopted by Quintilian and those who advocated the teaching of τὸ ἰδιαιτέρον as superior to τὸ ἱστορικόν is closely paralleled by modern views of teaching Shakespeare. The Clarendon Press editions, which restricted them-

selves mainly to *ἑλληνιστῶν καὶ ἱστορῶν ἀπόδοσις*, have now given place to the Pitt Press and other editions, in which *κρίσις* plays a prominent part.

⁴ Quint. i. 4, 4, 'nec poetas legisse satis est: excutiendum omne scriptorum genus non propter historias modo, sed uerba, quae frequenter ius ab auctoribus sumunt,' does not contradict this. Quintilian is here speaking of the equipment of the 'grammaticus' himself. Just as he will require some knowledge of astronomy and music, so he must read prose-writers, both in order to master the rules of language and to enable him to deal adequately with the 'historiae' of the poets.

viction so nobly expressed by Horace in the first epistle of the second book.¹ But it is also probably due to a pedagogic reason which remains for all time. Many teachers to-day, I fancy, find it exceedingly difficult to treat English prose-writers with any effect in school, and to produce a satisfactory examination paper upon them is as a rule still more difficult. The teacher may very possibly prefer *Robinson Crusoe* or *Treasure Island* to a play of Shakespeare, or at any rate think them more suitable and interesting for young boys, but he has not the slightest idea what to do with them in class. They have no γλώσσαι or ἱστορίαι, and I do not think they would lend themselves to ἐξηγήσεις κατὰ τρόπους, even if our schoolmasters knew anything of this last. We gather from Quintilian ii. 5 that when the orators and historians were read in the rhetorical schools they were merely read as models,² and little attempt was made to treat them in the same systematic way in which the poets were treated in the grammatical schools. Greek 'rhetors' sometimes attempted something of the sort, though even they usually delegated it to their assistants. Quintilian himself advocated it, but only to the extent of giving literary appreciations, and even this he found was unwelcome to many of his pupils.

The *Classical Quarterly* is not the place to discuss modern educational questions, but I may perhaps be allowed to say in conclusion that the ancient teachers of literature had thought out their business with a care and thoroughness from which their modern successors have much to learn. There is a tendency to depreciate the schools of the Empire, and I am free to admit that in some ways they did their work too well. 'They swamped the sacred poets with themselves.' But I cannot think that their work was on the whole unsuccessful. It is true that neither 'grammatica' nor rhetoric taught people to write or speak with genius and power (what school ever did or could?), but they did teach a very clear insight into the meaning, nature, and functions of language. Perhaps their work may best be seen in two products of these centuries, which have had at any rate a very remarkable permanence—the Roman Codes and the Creeds of the Christian Church.

F. H. COLSON.

¹ Also admirably stated by Mr. Garrod in his introduction to the *Oxford Book of Latin Verse*.

² And also for the value of the subject-matter as 'exempla.'

SALAPANTIVM DISERTVM.

Catullus liii. 5.

Di magni, salapantium disertum.

Our best MSS. agree upon *salapantium*. But they also agree upon *desertum* for *disertum*. Seneca, who quotes the last two words of the line, has *salaput(t)ium disertum*; and since he is right about *disertum* it is supposed that he is right about *salaputium*; and *salaputium* stands in all our texts of Catullus. What it means nobody knows. It is mostly relegated to that numerous class of Latin words of which we conjecture that they are obscene and are content that they should remain obscure. A few commentators, aiming at respectability in their etymologies, connect it unconvincingly with the Greek *σαλπιγκτής*. But no one will say what is the matter with the *salapantium* of Catullus' MSS.; and I begin to think that it has not occurred to anybody that it has got, or could have, a meaning. I say 'to anybody'; yet I am not sure that the scribe of the *Codex Ashburneri*, or the scholar he served, did not long ago find the truth. The *Codex Ashburneri*, often cited by Ellis, is in the main a worthless MS.: I have myself examined it for hours on end. But it has here a not uninteresting variant. It offers the form *salafantium*, i.e. *salaphantium*. *Salaphantium* is a diminutive of *salaphanta*. Someone called Calvus 'an eloquent little *salaphant*.' And why not? If he had called him 'an eloquent little sycophant' we should have understood him well enough. And there is not a whole world of difference between a sycophant and a salaphant. A salaphant is the same thing as a halophant (or halapant)—the one word is merely a hybrid variant for the other: and the halophant and sycophant occur together in literature more than once. Nonius p. 172, Lindsay, has

*halophantam aut sycophantam, hominum genus nequam quod ob suenda
mendacia miserrima mercede conducitur,*

and he goes on to quote Plautus, *Curculio* 463,

halophantamne aut sycophantam magis esse dicam <nescio>,

and from some unknown comedian

halophantam mendacem uelit.

Festus, in the excerpt of Paulus (Lindsay, p. 90), offers the form *halapanta*. 'Significat omnia mentientem,' he says (suggesting an inept derivation which need not detain us).

Halophanta, *halapanta*, *salap(h)anta*, then, are one and the same word, a word formed humorously on the analogy of *sycophanta*, and meaning *any liar on a large scale whose services may be hired*. The 'nescio quis e corona' who lifted his hands in astonishment and called Calvus a *salapantium* (he used the diminutive because, as Seneca says, Calvus was 'paruolus statura') meant to call him plainly 'a mighty little liar'; and that was what made Catullus laugh.

H. W. GARROD.

MERTON COLLEGE, OXFORD.

agree upon
the line, has
supposed that
s of Catullus.
merous class
are content
respectability
σαλπιγκτής.
of Catullus'
at it has got,
ure that the
ong ago find
ain a worth-
as here a not
utium. Sala-
'an eloquent
loquent little
here is not a
A salaphant
erely a hybrid
together in

d ob suenda

io>

ETYMOLOGIES AND DERIVATIONS.

I. Sanskrit *medīn* 'comes': *μετά*.

1. IN Skr. *medīn* we have an Indo-Iranian *-in* derivative of a proethnic start-form (s)*met-sdos* 'co-sedens,' whose initial *s* may have been lost by haplology, but cf. Av. *maṭ* 'μετά.' Homeric *ἄοζος* 'attendant' (start-form *sm-sodyos*) is a like compound, meaning *co-sedens* and not 'mitgänger' (pace Johansson *IF*. III. 199), but has suffered psilosis. Out of composition, unless the 'suffix' conceals a posterius, we may have a further cognate in Lat. *sodalis* 'boon-companion,' wherein *sodā-* may have meant something like 'session' (the council or board of elders in the Scotch kirk).

2. I further hold that *μετά*, before it became an adverb and preposition, must have functioned as a noun, **μέτα*, meaning 'comes'; and as an adverb in Homer it has scarcely passed beyond the sense of 'comes' as used, with or without a dative regimen, in combination with *ἵ* 'goes' (= geht mit; cf. e.g. Tibullus 1. 4. 41; *Aen.* 6. 159; see a collection of the usage in *Class. Journal* 8, 253). The noun type in *-ᾱ* (? *ᾱ*), excluding dubious cases like Homeric *ἱπποτα*, is best illustrated by Latin words like *aducna* (with secondary *n* for *m*). As *ad-uena* is a compound, so I analyze **μέτα* as a compound of *sm*, preaccentual reduction of *som*, + *eta* (*etā*?) 'errans, currens, iens': Skr. *ātati* 'errat.' I have found this noun before now in Homeric *ἔται* 'comites,' from *sw-* 'co-' + *ἔται* 'euntes' (*AJPh.* 28, 166), as also, *excep. excip.*, in Latin *com-et-*. That in *comes* the *e* may be original and not represent an *i* (so already Ebel in *KZ.* 5, 187, anno 1856) seems to me demonstrated by the following cognation:

II. Latin *pedet*:- Skr. *padātis* 'foot-soldier.'

3. The Petersburg lexicæ give the following forms: *padāti-s*, *pādāt* (lexical only), *pādāta-s*, *padāta-s* (pronounced incorrect). The first form is a good epic word, and was analyzed in PW¹ (1865) as '*pad-* oder *pada-* + *āti* "gehend" von *at-*,' though Walter had in the meantime (1861) already advanced the now reigning explanation whereby *equet-* e.g. is equated with *ἱππότης* (*KZ.* 10, 194 sq.); and the analysis of *padāti-* as a compound was expressly rejected (p. 205). Walter's conclusion has been held pretty much ever since, so that one would search in vain in the handbooks for a reference from *pedes* to *padāti-s* (e.g. in Walde², p. 579). But, as Bartholomæ saw (*BB.* 17, 114¹), we cannot

separate the two words, and Skr. *pattis* looks also to belong with them. When Bartholomae sweepingly declares that the division *pad- + āti-s* 'iens' is false, that is purely gratuitous on his part. Every objection to that analysis meets a ready answer. The root *a²t-* is alive in Sanskrit only: true, but it yielded before *i-t-*: *ēy-*. The IE. language probably had several words for 'going' allocated to different sorts of goers, to different modes of motion. The unique survival of some of these is quite in the range of probability; and so is their tautological combination as, say, in Skr. *āt-ya-s* 'horse' (§ 12). For the survival in composition of the root *et/ot*, for this was its vocalism, I have brought a good deal of evidence in *Classical Quarterly* 3, 272, and I have collected a great deal more that I propose to present in another paper. The objection that *padāti-* is a *ti-* stem, Lat. *pedet-* a *t-* stem, needs no answer, but cf. lexical Skr. *pādāt*. The objection that will weigh most is against the difference of quantity in *-et-* and *-āti-*.

4. In arguing on this point, without denying that in *padāti-* we may have a prius *padā* (instrum.), I exclude it from consideration, and I shall write the vowel of the (supposed) posterius *-otis* with *ō* because that is the vowel appropriate for the posterius. Also, though I believe that *pattis* is to be derived from *pad-sthis*: Skr. *pada-sthas* (see *AJPh.* 34, 39, § 95), I shall here consider it as derived from the root *et-*.

5. Sanskrit compounds of the type of *rathā-sāh-* 'curru-capax' (sc. equus) are believed to contain $\sim \sim \sim$ for $\sim \sim \sim$ (see Wackernagel *ai. Gram.* II, 1, § 56; cf. I. § 264 sq.), and it is current dogma to limit that lengthening to compounds of the type $\sim - \sim$: \sim and exclude it from compounds of the type $\sim : - \sim$, words like Lith *ap-ėmis* 'circumference': *ap-ėminas* 'umnehmen,' *κυν-ῶπις* 'dog-eyed,' Av. *h<u>v-āpah-* 'bonum-sacrum-habens.' In words of this class (cf. Lat. *ambāges*) the long vowel is explained by — gradation, which is to put the effect before the cause. Thus Av. *huv-āpah-* is equated with Skr. (*su-*) *āpas-*, there being in the RV. a hapax *āpas-* over against a fairly common word *apas-* 'sacrum,' quantitatively equal to Lat. *opus-*, in the word *operari*, which means 'sacrificare.' There is no way to make people believe, I suppose, that the long-grade vocalism of the *amb-āges* type arose by rhythmic lengthening in compounds, as long as they prefer to believe that a long-grade vocalism arose — by long-grade vocalism and then found its place in compounds. For myself, I believe that Vedic *āpas-* is a sporadic use of an original composition-form with lengthened *ā-* to suit metrical convenience. In quadrisyllabic forms like Vedic *hari-sācas* and Av. *gairi-sāč-ō* the posterius comes from *sēkw-es* (n. pl.) 'sequentes.' Whether we call this type rhythmic ($\sim \sim \sim \sim$) or gradational is a matter of entire indifference when we extend the mere question of fact to the explanation of *padā-tis*, for the form **péd-ōti-s* is a perfectly legitimate construction from *ped-* (or *pod-*) + a derivative of the root *et-* 'errare,' and instead of a metrical lengthening we may reckon with weakening, and derive Skr. *pattis* from **ped(o)tī-s*.

6. In Homeric *ἀσπιδι-ώτης* 'in scuto iens' we have another military term

with posterius *-ōti-* (-της: Skr. *ti-*, cf. δεσπότης: Skr. *dām-pati-s*). The clear locative prius is also found in Homeric ἀγροί-ώτης 'in agro iens.' Any reason that may be urged against taking *pad-āti-s* for a compound may be urged as validly against Sophocles' ποδ-ᾱγός 'attendant':¹ Skr. *pad-āji-* (Pāṇini), as to which see Wackernagel, *l.c.* II. 1. 62. In view of what has been said I believe no consistent reason can be advanced against taking Skr. *pad-āti-s* as a compound, precisely as Böhtlingk and Roth did take it. Besides, we have a second Greek military word in στρατι-ώτης 'soldier,' wherein I take the prius as a locative to a lost monosyllable *styt-*, whence στρατ- in στρατ-ᾱγός. Besides the disyllable *-ōti-* in *pad-āti-* we have the root-noun *ot-* in Lat. *ped-et-* (Bartholomae's *ē* in *pedēs*, *BB.* 17, 114 fn., lacks, to the best of my knowledge, all metrical confirmation).

III. Lat. *equet-*: Skr. *ācva-pati-s*.

7. The addiction of scholars for more than half a century to the equation of ἵππότης with *eques* is most extraordinary. Thus ἵππότης is an abstract, your 'horseship'—which seems incredible—and *equet-* is an abstract too, with *-tā* (cf. *senecta*) reduced to *-t*. Now Ger. *majestät*, Ital. *podesta*, Eng. *your highness*, I understand; and *opera* (1) auxilium, (2) auxiliator, I understand, but 'your horseship'—no. So as Greek δεσπότης corresponds to Skr. *dām-pati-s* I feel constrained to believe that ἵππότης is from *ἵππό[πο]της = Skr. *ācva-pati-s* 'horse-lord' (VS.), also a proper name, cf. Ἱπποτα Νέστωρ.

8. What would have become of proethnic **ékwo-potis* in Italic? In certain of the dialects, assuming a stage before any sort of syncope existed, **epo-potis*, liable to haplologic shortening precisely as ἵππότης. But in pre-Latin we should expect **equo-pot(i)s*, with possible loss of *i* as in *hospes*, if from **hosti-potis* rather than **hosti-pa-x-t* 'stranger-protecting.' How would *qu-p-* in a Latin word have been treated? Certainly *p-qu-* was assimilated to *qu-qu-* (see e.g. Walde², s.v. *prope*). If *qu-p-* (bear in mind a *qu* that may have gotten quite close to the *p* of the other dialects) was also assimilated to *qu-qu-*, then *equet-* from **equo-[quo]t(i)s* is a simple case of haplology. What actually happened may have been quite different. As *anceps* is from *ambi+caput* and *hospes* from *hosti+potis* (or *-pots*), *eques* may represent something like **equ(o)-pot-s* (disyllable) with assimilation (eventual loss) of *p* after *qu* owing to the strong influence of *equos* 'horse.' Those who lay great weight on rigidity of equation symbols, formal regularity, will perhaps prefer to say that *eques* is for dialectic **epo[po]ti-s* affected by Latin *equos*.

IV. Latin *Cocles*.

9. The difficulty of accounting for *Cocles* as the borrowed word Κύκλωψ seems to me insurmountable, but the two words are most closely cognate. To correspond with κύκλος, Skr. *cakrá-m* 'wheel, circle,' we should expect

¹ Herein ποδ- is quasi-prepositional: Aeolic in attendance on a chariot. πεδ-ά 'cum'; cf. *pad-* in Skr. *pad-ratha-s* 'footman'

Latin *quoqlo-* whence *cocolo-*, and this, compounded with the monosyllabic stem *oqu-*, represented in the diminutive *oculus*, would yield (with elision of the stem *-o*) *cocl'oc-*. The change from *cocloc-* to *coclot-* was due to avoidance of three successive *c*'s.

V. Latin *pōples* 'knee, hamstring,' etc.

10. I interpret *pōpl-et-* as dialectic from *cocl'et-*: *cocolo-* 'wheel.' Etymologically considered, the wheel was merely a 'goer,' as we use 'runner'¹ to describe the sliding-iron of a sled. Latin *cocolo-* designated, I take it, some part of the leg, and belongs semantically with Skr. *carāṇa-s* = *caritra-m* (see § 14) 'foot, leg.' Walde², s.v. *colo*, cites O.Bulg. *kolo* 'wheel': *kolēno* 'knee.' Here a special semantic closeness is shown by Ger. (*knie*-)*scheibe*, for the 'patella' or 'knee-pan' is a sort of disc or wheel. For the posterius of *pōpl-et* we must compare *κώλ-ηπ-* 'the popliteal space' = 'knie-kehle,' recalling that Prellwitz has already expressed the suspicion that *-ηπ-* belongs with Lat. *apere* 'to bind,' cf. Eng. *ham-string*, which is one sense of *pōples*. This justifies us in deriving *pōplet-* from *k^wek^wl'-ap* (or *-ap-*), whence, with dissimilation of the third *p*, dialectic *pōpl'et-*. The startform of *κώληψ* may have been *k^wōl(o) + ā^xp-*, with labial dissimilation of *k^w-* from the following *p-*. But the influence of *σκέλος* is not to be excluded.

VI. *κωλώτης* 'lizard': *lacerta*.

11. The lizard, if one will examine the habits of the commoner kinds, is a limb-goer, putting his whole leg rather than his foot only upon the ground. Hence he is named from *κώλο-* 'leg' + *-ωτης* 'errans.' The same notandum in *ἀ-σκάλα-βος* = *ἐν-σκέλει-βαίνων*. By irradiation from *κωλώτης* we have *ἀ-σκάλα-βώτης* and *γαλεώτης*. Similarly I explain *lacer-ta* as syncopated (cf. *Minerva*, etc.) from an original *laces-* or *lacer-* 'leg, limb' [: O.Norse *legg*, which Lidén (ap. Walde² s.v. *lacertus*) has derived from a pre-Germanic *lagiz-*; or: *λέκρα-να-τοὺς ἄγκωνας* (cf. *λικερ-τίζειν σκιρτᾶν*)] + *eta* (as in *μ-ετά*, § 2) or *i-ta* 'iens,' the whole again = 'limb-going.' The prius *laces-* | *lacer-* would be a suffixless locative (cf. Brugmann, Gr², 2. 2 §§ 174-175 for parallels). For *lacertus* 'arm,' I write a startform *lacer[s]t(h)o-s* (for [s] see Fay *AJPh.* 33, p. 383; and for the confix *-sthos* in names of parts of the body, *ib.* 34, p. 23, § 58 sq.), first of the out-standing lump of muscles on the upper arm. Lat. *-ertus* may be, however, from *erto-* (or *erto-*): Skr. *-ṛt* in *yákr̥t-* 'liver.' Note that in the *lacertus* and *σκέλος* | *κῶλον* group a root *lëk* varies with *s)kël-*.

VII. Sanskrit *ṛtvik* (nom. sg.) 'sacerdos quidam.'

12. The final *k* is of palatal provenance, and should have given *-ṛ*. Wackernagel, *ai. Gram.* I. 1, § 149 aa, remarks: 'Der guttural hielt sich hinter *r* (auch in *ṛtvik*!), weil die nachbarschaft von *r-* laut und cerebral gescheut wurde.' This is a truly curious effect for *r* to have at such a distance,

¹ Cf. *τροχός* 'wheel' = *τρέχει* 'runs.'

when in *rāṭ* and *saṃrāṭ* 'king,' *bhrāṭ* 'gleam,' *r-* has no effect. I rather think that in the sequence *t-k* *k* was the result of preventive dissimilation in avoidance of the group *-t-k*.

VIII. Avestan *-ṣarāt-* : κέλητ-.

13. Bartholomae defines the Avestan compound *ravas-ṣarāt-* by 'was sich im freien bewegt,' i.e. 'ruri-cola,' used in Ovid of an ox or a bull roaming at large (*Met.* 15, 124; 11, 91), as *ravas-ṣarāt-* is used of wild animals. The equation of *-ṣarāt-* with Greek κέλητ- 'riding horse' is perfect; both being from the startform *k^welēt-*, whence Greek κέλητ-, with *κ-* for *τ-* by preventive dissimilation. As to its derivation, κέλ-ητ- is a tautological compound, quasi 'wander-roaming,' with *ē* in the oblique cases (~~) for the reason that *ā* is long in *padāti-* (§ 3). For tautological compounds of this type note should be made of the great variety of IE. verbs of motion, and for this particular compound of the fact that its separate elements were, as monosyllables, unstable (cf. Wackernagel, *ap. IF. Anz.* 24, 114). Skr. *āt-ya-s* 'horse' is also a compound, prius *et-*, posterius *-yo-s* (: the root *ei*).

IX. Sanskrit *car-itra-m*, *bhar-itra-m* ; θύετρα 'foris.'

14. The usual division is *carī-tram*, but the conditions that allow of explaining *carī-tram* from *car-* allow as well of explaining **ītram* from *i-* 'ire,' and the complex *car-ītram* (cf. *car-itā-m* 'itio') as tautological. The tautological principle of composition (see Fay, *KZ.* 45, 112; *AJPh.* 32, 408) exists and always has existed. Note an example like Germ. *schell-hengst* or English *might-and-main*. Given an old Greek **et-po-* 'door' (: *et-* 'errare' :: Lat. *iā-nu-a* 'door' [cf. Skr. *yā-na-s* 'via']: *yā-* 'ire'), θύε-τρα (Homer) becomes as transparent as *schell-hengst*. With *car-ītram* 'leg' cf. *bhar-itra-m* 'arm.' In both of these alike old *-i-tro-* 'goer, leg,' whence 'limb,' may be contained. Then *car-ītram* was the 'go-limb,' and *bhar-ītram* the 'carry-limb.' In Greek φέρε-τρον 'bier' -ετρον will be still a 'goer,' but in the sense of 'vehiculum' or 'go-cart,' while φερ- will indicate its use in carrying (cf. Eng. *carriage*). A collection of examples might show that the Greek words in *-ετρο-* parallel with Skr. words in *-itra-* all allow of explanation by irradiation from patterns in which the force of *-ετρο-* and *-i-tra-* is still clear to sight. Note also Skr. *car-iṣṇū-* 'se mouens, errans, instabilis' with *-iṣṇu-* : *iṣṇāti* 'accelerat.'

X. Sanskrit *divīt*, *divītmant-* : Latin *divit-*.

15. There are two competing definitions and analyses of *divīt*. Grassmann defines as 'splendour,' but the Petersburg lexicon, followed by Wackernagel (*ai. Gram.* 2, § 22a), as well as Ludwig and Griffith in their translations, analyze as *div-it-* 'ad caelum iens.' For Grassmann's definition cf. Aufrecht in *KZ.* 2, 149, and Grassmann himself *ibid.* 11, 9, though in his translation of *RV.* 10, 76, 6 (see below) he goes over to the other camp. In *BB.* 12, 114 fn.

Bartholomae takes *divlt* as a noun, but does not define it. Aufrecht compared *divlt-* for its formation with *harlt*, a colour adjective = 'bright'—which does not keep the *-t-* of *divlt-* from being the *t* of *dyút-* 'splendour.' In form *divi-t-* 'bright': *dī-divi-s* 'splendidus,' is not unlike *harī-t-*: *hari-s*; cf. for the reduplication *sarīt-* 'flumen' (cf. Eng. 'current'): *sa-srī-s* 'currens': *sa-srū-t-* 'fluens,' with further examples in Brugmann, *Gr.*² 2. 1, § 316. The analysis as *div-It-* leaves *div-* hard to account for as a terminus ad quem, at least Sanskrit exhibits no parallel case with a prius *div-* = 'ad caelum.'

16. The words *divlt-* and *divltmant* are practically confined to *RV.*, and *divlt-* is a hapax. The examples are:

1. 26. 2 (Arnold's A period) where Agni, invited to sit at the sacrifice, is addressed in the line 'Agne divltmatā vācaḥ' (= *vācasā*) and Grassmann's rendering by 'Agni durch unser glänzend lied' is certainly not less apt than Griffith's 'through our heavenly word.'

4. 31. 11 (Arnold's A), mahó rayé divltmate. Grassmann: 'zu glänzendem besitz des guts'; Griffith: 'for great celestial opulence.'

5. 79. 1 (Arnold's B¹), twice repeated in *SV.*, 'mahé no adyá bhodayaúšo rāyé divltmatī.' Grassmann: 'zu grossem reichthum weck' uns heut, o morgenroth, zu glänzendem; Griffith: 'O heavenly dawn, awaken us to ample opulence to-day.'

10. 76. 6 (Arnold's B¹), *vācā divltā divltmatā*. Grassmann: 'mit schall der zu dem himmel dringt,' not substantially different from Griffith's 'with heavenly song that rushes up to heaven.' Aufrecht (l.s.c.) had taken *d. d.* as 'mit strahlendem glanze.' I deviate from Aufrecht by rendering the words *v. d. d.* 'uoce splendente splendidissima' (see below), though there is a possibility of taking *divltā d.* as a very early instance of an instrum. qual. = uoce splendore splendidissimo. For the construction see Speyer, *Skr. Synt.* § 67, where we have the examples *koṣaḥ svalpa-vyayena* = aerarium parui-expenso and *vividhāir drumāiḥ kānanam* 'uariis arboribus siluam' (see also Brugmann, *Gr.*² 2. 2. § 468; Delbrück, *Gr.*¹ 3. § 106). Thus interpreted *divltā divltmatā* is not unlike *hāritvatā vācasā* 'aureo splendore' (instrum. of means) in *RV.* 10. 112. 3. Morphologically the 'possessive' *hāritvant-* (hapax) would seem to be a mere irradiation from *divlt-mant-* (with *m* in avoidance of the sequence *v-v*, cf. Schulze *KZ.* 39. 612; Bender, Suffixes *-mant* and *-vant*, p. 39).¹

17. But *divlt-* is susceptible of defence as an adjective of the *harit-* type, while *divltmant-* 'splendidus' may be a blend, so to speak, of *divit-* 'splendens' with *dyu-mánt* 'splendorem habens' (cf. in Macdonnell's *Vedic Grammar* § 246 fn. on the intrusion of *d* from *ad-bhuta-* 'marvellous' into *an-ati<d>bhuta-* 'unsurpassed').

¹ Bender's remarks on the general analogy that may have produced *tāvasvant* from *tavīs* (p. 32 fn.) do not agree with his explanation of the accent of *hāritvant-* on p. 41, fn. 2, and **hāritvant-* were as permissible as *divltmant-*. It

may be as well to suppose that when nominalized in the possessive derivative a secondary accent of diacritic purport was given to the adj. stem *harit* (i.e. **hārit-* 'splendour').

18. In its usage *divltmant* once qualifies *rāyé*= Lat. *rei* (dat.) and once follows *rāyé*, but is in agreement with *uṣas* 'Aurora.' One wonders if here (5. 79. 1) *divltmatī*, instead of being a nom. voc. is a dative in *-tī*, cf. *ūtī* (frequent), *vītī* (2°), see Macdonnell p. 232, a. Or is it a (masc.) dat.-loc. in *-ī* of the type described, but not yet conclusively found (see, however, O.Bulg. *i*- datives in Brugmann, *Gr.*² 2. 2. § 162. 1) by Bartholomae (*Gr. Iran. Phil.* 1. § 217)? It may rather be an emendation of the Vedic diaskeuast who, staggering at *rāy-é* (usually feminine) with a masc. adjective *divltmate*, and ignorant of *RV.* 4. 31. 11, altered to *divltmatī*, in construction with *uṣas*. The remaining instances of *divltmant* agree with *vācā* 'voce' or *vācas* 'Fēnos' (see Delbrück in *KZ.* 20, 227). That the sense of 'splendidus' is here admissible ought to be clear from Latin combinations like *uox suavis et splendida*, *uerba splendida* (Cicero), cf. also *uerba luculentiora*, *scriptor luculentus* (Cicero), *oratio luculenta* (Sallust). That *divltmant* moves in the same semantic range as *dyu-mánt* (see § 17) is manifest, for we have *dyumánt-* with *rāyás* 'rei' (gen. 1°), with the cognate word *rayt-s* (3°), and with their synonyms *bhāgas* (1°) and *ṣām* (1°); also with *vāc-am* 'vocem' (2°) and with *vācas-* (1°).

19. In view of the characteristic combination of *dyumánt* | *divltmant-* with the words for 'wealth' (*rāy-* | *rayt-*: Lat. *rēs*)—cf. also the parallelism of the adverbially used neuters *revāt* || *dyumāt* in *RV.* 2. 9. 6; 5. 23. 4; 6. 48. 7 (in every case qualifying the imperative *dī-dī-hi* 'splende')—I find myself quite unwilling to follow Schulze in *KZ.* 45. 190 and divorce Lat. *diuet-* 'rich,' *diuitiae* 'riches' (with adj. *luculentae* in Plautus, cf. also *luculenta* hereditas; in Cicero, *secundas res splendidiore facit amicitia*) from Vedic *divit-*. So far as the root goes, there is no issue to join with Schulze; but, in conformity with Skr. *divlt-*, Lat. *diuet-* must be explained from 'shining' and not from 'sky,' though if proethnic **dīwit-* had come into Latin with some of its original sense it may well have come under the influence of *diuum* (cf. *sub dio* 'under the bright sky' with *ἥν-διος* 'meridianus'). What came into Latin may have been *dīw-* (or *deiū-*)et, cf. *et* in *ἄπρῆτ-* 'white.'

XI. O.Bulg. *bogatŭ* 'Fortunatus.'

20. Nor can I admit Schulze's parallel instance, after Schroeder as cited, of O.Bulg. *bogatŭ* 'Fortunatus,' and formed morphologically like *Fortunā-tus*, but its prius is to be correlated with Av. *barā-* 'pars, portio': Skr. *bhāga-* 'share, wohlstand,' and the connotation of 'fortuna' or even 'diuitiae' is clear from the hapax compound *bhāga-bhaktasya* (*rāyás*)=quasi 'fortuna-diuisae (rei),' cf. also *bhāgavant* 'gut-begabt.' In Indo-Iranian *bhāga* is the Dispenser (God), but also the dispensed ('wealth'). In O.Bulg. we have *bogu* 'god,' but when Schulze writes 'der arme heisst bei den Slaven "von den göttern verlassen"; *ubogŭ-* und *nebogŭ-*' we may admit that this is now the popular interpretation, but surely we must start with 'ἄμμορος, ἄμοιρος,

expers' (as found, with some redundancy, in Terence, *Heaut.* 652, *ne expers partis esset de nostris bonis*). Rather is *bogatŭ* like Latin *nummātus*.

XII. Latin *gurg-et-* 'eddy.'

21. In this complex I define *gurg-* by 'swallowing,' a broken reduplication form, however we explain the abnormality of *g*, to the root of *uorat*. The combination *gurg-et-* meant 'swallow-going,' no bad description of an eddy for one who has seen the swirl and down-suck of it. The sense of 'eddy' is found in a derivative of *et*, precisely in the word *eddy*: O.Norse *ida*. The combination of the notions 'errare' and 'circulare' is found in Eng. *troll*: *stroll* (cf. Skeat or the Oxford Dictionary), and is as old as the time when the *planets* ('stellae errantes') were observed to go round the earth, or when a 'wheel' was a 'goer' (see § 10). It is a fact, or a superstition, of wood-craft that a man when lost always wanders round and round in a circle.

XIII. Sanskrit *senā-nī*: *κοῖπα-voσ*.

22. The correspondence of *senā-nī* 'general' with Germ. *herzog* cannot have escaped the notice of anybody whose attention has once been drawn to *senā-nī*. Their Homeric synonym is *κοῖπavοσ*, and *-voσ* = 'dux.' The correlation of *-voσ*: Skr. *nī-* 'ducere' is the same as the correlation of *-çá-s* in *giri-çás* 'in monte cubans': *-çī-* in *syona-çī-s* 'in-molli-(lecto-) cubans.' The shortening of the *a* in *κοῖπα-*: Germ. *heer* will have taken place as in *μοῖπα*. Whether the shortening demonstrably took place before the composition is a question of chronology I know not how to determine.

XIV. Sanskrit *syoná-* 'soft': *εὐνή* 'bed.'

23. The aspirate in *καθ-εῦδω* 'I sleep' gives some warrant for supposing *εὐνή* to be for **εὐνή*: *syoná-* in the Sanskrit compound just cited. It is curious that the derivation of *syoná-* has not been hitherto realized. It will have meant 'pliant' to start with, and belong with *syūman-* 'band': the root *sīv-* *syū-* 'plectere' (earlier sense than 'suere'). In *-εῦ-δεῖν* the complex will have meant '(se) lecto dare,' and original **syēu-* may have been a locative to a noun stem **syu-*. In general, cf. *δέμνιον* 'bed, bedding': the root of Lat. *domare* 'binden' (earlier than 'bändigen,' and also found in Lat. *domus*, the 'wattled house'). In *Wört. u. Sach.* 3. 52 sq. Meringer would unite Lat. *texit* 'weaves' with *τέκτων* 'carpenter' by defining their root as 'flectere,' and I think this is right. The sphere in which *syoná-* moves is seen in *syonā cāsi suśadā* (*VS.*) which Bloomfield cites in *AJPh.* 33. 9 with a TB. variant. His rendering is 'pleasant art thou and a fair seat to rest on.'

XV. Vedic *kṛtād-vasu-* 'diuidens-bona.'

24. The Rigveda has *viddād-vasu-* 'inueniens-bona' four times (three times in Arnold's A hymns, once in his B²) and the hapax *ābharād-vasu-* 'afferens-bona'

(5. 79. 1), both perfectly clear compounds. The hapax *ṣatād-vasu-* (1. 119. 1 = B²) will certainly be for **ṣatā-vasu-*, as it follows another compound with *sahāsra-* 'thousand.' For *kṛtād-vasu-* (8. 31. 9), it would seem that we might satisfy ourselves with the plain etymological interpretation of the pādas *ab: vīlīhotrā kṛtādvasū* (*ū* with the pāda-text) | *daṣyāntā 'mṛtāya kām* = <The household-pair> inviting-to-a-feast, cutting-goodies, bestowing <these> verily on the Immortal. With *-vasu* in the compound cf. *bon-bons* and *goodies*.

XVI. Vedic *pratād-vasū* (RV. 8. 13. 27).

25. In this stanza Indra is supplicated to yoke his sorrels, his boon-companions (*sadhamādyā*), his *pratādvasū* (dual) and rattle-along (*abhī-svara*) to the soma-drinking. In such a context we may credit the composer of the hymn, that ancient poet of wine, with looking upon the sorrels who are to fetch Indra to the convivium as sharing in the extraction or preparation of that boon. The word preparation brings us to ask whether *pratād* may have to do with Lat. *parare*, but its *-t-* would then have to be explained. The word extraction brings us to the root *pret-* as found in Lat. *pressi* (see Fay, KZ. 43, 351), and to Skr. *pit-* 'battle,' i.e. 'press' (of battle). Note also *pit-sutī-s* 'proeli' impetus,' where *-sutī-s* comes either from the root *su-* 'premere' or from *sū-* 'impel, hurl,' not certainly different roots. The assumption precedent is that the root *pret-* was used to describe the extraction of sap or milk by pressure (or by boring). Here, in using *pratād*, the poet may have had in mind the spirting, splashing, spattering of the drops as the soma-stalks were a-crushing and the like spatter of mud by the racing horses. One asks oneself whether ultimately *pratād* is not 'dashing' (trans.), cognate with O.Norse *spretta* 'salire' (intrans.), cf. Eng. *sprints*. I assume here no violation of Grimm's law. In O.Norse *spretta tt* may have come from proethnic *-tn-* as well as from a prior Norse *sprenta*, and the fixation of *tt* in this or some like formation may have analytically influenced the *nt* group in the sept of *sprints*.

26. For the relation of Skr. *pit-* 'battle': Latin *prem-it*, pf. *pressit*, note Bartholomae's third definition (Wtbch. 869) of *parat-* 'jemandem (acc.) feindlich entgegen, zu leibe gehen' (= Lat. *aliquem petere*), a sense not alien to Lat. *premit* 'presses, chases, pursues' (game, the enemy). Semantically, O.Norse *s)prettā* = 'salire,' Av. *parət-* = 'insilire' (in the late Latin sense of 'adoriri'). Should we start with a compound *per-et-* 'praeire; adoriri'—or a tautological compound, with cumulative force, of the root *per-* 'to pierce, fare,' and the root *et-* 'to wander, run' (cf. on Latin *interpret-* § 34)—the sense of 'squeeze, press,' would have developed as a description of the concomitant or sequel action involved in 'piercing.'

XVII. Avestan *frātaṭ-čarəta-* 'pro-fluens, rapidus.'

27. Passing over Bartholomae's most complicated explanation as *frā-tatčarə-ta*, and holding to the traditional division as a compound, I would explain *frātaṭ-* as an adverbially used neuter of the present participle = prae-

currenter (from *pro-+et-* 'currere') combined with a *t-* derivative of the root ⁵*kar* (Bartholomae, 449) 'uersari,' viz.: *cār-t-* (for so in three of the four citations we find the stem): *čar-āt-* (§ 13). Skr. *at-* is actually defined by 'laufen' (PW.).

XVIII. Πρωτεσί-λαος 'qui praecurrit populum.'

28. Every IE. name may be significant, a tell-tale name. The name of Protesilaos, if I have properly divined its meaning, tells us all about him that we learn from Homer, ἀποθρῶσκοντα πολὺν πρῶτιστον Ἀχαιῶν (B. 698 sq.). The quantity agreement of Πρωτεσί[-λαος] and Av. *frātāt-* raises the question whether *ā* represents an IE. contraction of *o+e*. There is very little evidence to settle this question (cf. Brugmann, *Gr.*² I. § 964), and it would require compounds that had lost touch with their primitives to remove the suspicion that the junction vowel owed its colour to the semantic, not the phonetic, preponderance of whichever vowel prevailed. In Πρωτεσί-, though compounded of *pro+eteti*, *ω* may be due to πρῶτος 'first' (? from *pro+ōlos* 'goer'; then Doric πρᾶτος has secondary *ā*, cf. the adverb πρᾶν and Latin *prā-ues* 'forward, pert').

XIX. Vedic *ānv-āitat* (A V. 18. 3. 40) 'consecutus est.'

29. This is a blend of *āit*, impf. 3d. sg. of the root *i-* 'ire' and *āitat*, the corresponding form from the root *at-* 'errare, currere.' For the previous discussion of the form see Lanman's note to Whitney's A V. (Harv. Or. Series, 8. 860).

XX. Avestan *patarəta-* (— —) 'flying.'

30. This, like Lat. *lacerta* (§ 11), is from a compound *pa^ala^r-eta* (or *-ita*) = 'in-pennā-iens.' Under what proethnic or pre-Avestan conditions the quadri-syllable (— — — —) was reduced to a trisyllable (— — —) cannot be made out.

XXI. ἡτορ 'heart': Skr. *āt-mán-* 'breath.'

31. These words and their cognates (see e.g. Prellwitz², s.vv. ἡτορ and ἄτμος) may be reasonably derived from the root *et-*. The heart, bosom, lungs, stomach (abdomen) are all in perpetual motion, a fact much more in ocular evidence in early savagery than now. According to Fick-Stokes⁴, p. 29, O.Ir. *in-athar* is from *én-ōtoro-*. This would mean the 'in-goer.'

XXII. Old Welsh *-interedou*.

32. The compound *permed-interedou* (glossed by 'ilia') will have come, in its posterius, from *enter<->eto-* (Fick-Stokes⁴, p. 30). Is *-eto-* itself a posterius = 'iens,' and the whole a newer, but still IE., formation to make more precise *en-tero-* (in *έν-τερον*) after *-tero-* was losing its force of 'going' (see Fay, *AJPh.* 31, 407)? The *ā* of Skr. *āntrā-* will be secondary.

XXIII. Sanskrit *kṛ-t-van-* 'machend, bewirkend.'

33. I have recently noted (*AJPh.* 34. 16, § 44 fn.) that the agent suffix *-ter-* (cf. for its origin Prellwitz², s.v. *τελρω*) gives evidence in such derivatives as Lat. *cul-tūr-a nātūra* of a by-form *-tver-* | *-tvor-* 'faciens': O.Bulg. *tvoriti* 'facere.' If we had Skr. *kṛ-tvar-* it would be tautological, quasi 'make-maker,' and *kṛ-tvan-* may have replaced the start-form **kṛtwor-* with *ṛ-* *-n* for *ṛ-* *-r*, cf. the normal feminine *kṛ-tvarī-* 'magical,' noting that *po-tvorū* means 'magic' (cf. Jevons in *Anthropology and the Classics*, p. 98). The different treatment of *kṛtvan-* and *kṛtvarī-* would be due to syllabification. Any root with *r* would present the conditions for dissimilation. The dissimilation was doubtless proethnic, for the feminine variation is found in the type of *πίων* fem. *πίερα*, where the *-tven* | *-twerī* type had been imitated by the *-wen-* type. Perhaps in a word like Skr. *ṛk-van-* we have the reduction of **ṛk-tvar-* 'carmen-faciens,' but a syncretic origin for *-w-en-* is also to be admitted.

XXIV. *ἀτμήν* 'interpres, nuntius.'

34. It is now (see Herwerden's *Lex Suppl.* s.v.) not open to reasonable doubt that *ἀτμήν* is a genuine word. We may take its *ἀ-* for an *α-*, a reduced stage of a long grade word in *ēl-*, cf. Prellwitz² s.v. *ἀτμός* 'vapour.' An *ἀτμήν* was, in our modern parlance, a 'runner,' as was an *inter-pr-et-* (on *pr-et-* see Fay, *Cl. Quart.* 3. 272).

XXV. Homeric *ἐπητής* 'entgegen-kommend, sociable.'

35. As a concluding testimony for the root *et* 'errare, currere, ire,' so often mentioned above, I cite *ἐπητής* with its abstract *ἐπητύς*. The sense of *ἐπ-ητες-* (with protracted *ē* as in § 5) is roughly 'approachable, accessible,' terms denoting a passive sort of friendliness. But the original sense (see on active-passive reciprocals Fay in *IF.* 29, 418) was rather active = 'approaching, sociable, entgegenkommend.' Comparable formations are Skr. *vī-vācas-* 'variously speaking,' *sā-vācas-* 'similarly speaking.' The accent of the Greek words is secondary, say after the synonymous pair *ὑαριστής* (= *apud socium* stands, see Fay, *AJPh.* 34. 33) *ὑαριστός*.

EDWIN W. FAY.

AUSTIN, TEXAS.

gent suffix *-ter-*
derivatives as
O.Bulg. *tvoriti*
quasi 'make-
or- with *r- -n*
that *po-tvorŭ*
p. 98). The
syllabification.
ion. The dis-
is found in the
en imitated by
the reduction
is also to be

to reasonable
n *2-*, a reduced
'vapour.' An
inter-pr-et- (on

e.'
rre, ire,' so
The sense of
le, accessible,'
sense (see on
'approaching,
skr. *vt-vācas*—
t of the Greek
=apud socium

IN W. FAY.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

LITERATURE AND GENERAL.

American Journal of Philology. Vol. 34. No. 3. 1913.

Emory B. Lease, *Neve and neque with the Imperative and Subjunctive*. Summarizes with statistics the usage of these particles to express prohibitions in the prose and verse literature. Rarer varieties, *et ne, ac ne*, etc., are also dealt with. Roy C. Flickinger, *The Accusative of Exclamation in Epistolary Latin*. C. F. W. Müller's canon, that *o* must be inserted in Cicero's letters to Atticus with names of things, is disproved. The idiom (*o* continually gaining) becomes more rigid as we move from Plautus to Pliny. H. C. Hoskier, *The Lost Commentary of Oecumenius on the Apocalypse*. Roland G. Kent, *Again Lucilius on EI and I*. A reply to Fay. Tenney Frank, *Marginalia* (a) Hor. *Epod.* 2. 26 (*queruntur* of birds means 'sing'; (b) Cic. *ad Att.* VII 2. 7; (c) Livy ap. Sen. *Suas.* VI 22; (d) Ennius *Med.* 259-61 (V.); (e) Cic. *Verr.* IV 163 (would read *aequaliter* for *aequaliter*). Charles Knapp, *De quibusdam locis primi Horati Sermonis*. Reviews: Drerup's *Iliad* V (W. K. Prentice), Mooney's *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius (E. Fitch).

Athenaeum (Pavia). Vol. I., Part IV. 1913.

A. Calderini, *The Epigrammi Cyzici in relation to tragedy*. C. agrees substantially with Meyer of Königsberg that the Epigrams were written by a scholar in the fifth or sixth century A.D., describing certain bas-reliefs on the temple of Apollo at Cyzicus II Cent. B.C.), the subjects for which were suggested by a pre-Alexandrine 'manual,' drawing on Greek tragedies. The *Epigrammi* are valuable for the reconstruction of lost tragedies. Carlo Pascal, *Ennius in the Middle Ages*. Ennius was famed as scientist and poet, but no one later than Isidorus had any direct knowledge of him, and Cicero and Claudius were taken for the authority on his merits. M. Valgimigli gives notes on various passages in the recently discovered Satyric drama of Sophocles, discusses the question whether the coryphaeus and Silenus are identical personages in the drama, and quotes certain passages where the Chorus and Silenus seem to be acting or speaking independently. J. Procacci, *Short notes on some passages of the Panegyrici Latini*. P. comments on emendations by W. Baehrens and others, and adds some of his own. V. Constanzi, *Zeus Thaulios*. Near Pharsalus an altar was found inscribed *Διος θαυλιον*, an epithet only found in two other inscriptions. Hesychius' lexicon gives *θαῦμος ἢ θαῦλος* as a designation of Ares among the Macedonians. Constanzi discusses the views of Hoffmann and others, and considers that the forms with *θαυλ-* are Atticized out of Macedonian **Δαυλος* just as Hesychius gives us *ξανθικά, ξανθῶ* = Maced. *ξανδικά, ξανδῶ*. He accepts Solmsen's view placing Thessalian *θαυλ-*, Macedonian *δauλ-* alongside of the Phrygian-Lyidian *κανδauλας* = *κυνάγχα*, and Phryg.-Lyd. *δαός*, 'the wolf' as 'strangler,' and *θαύλων* given as the *βουφόνος* among the Athenians. **Θαυλος* among the Macedonians, meaning 'slayer,' or even being the wolf himself, was then attached to Ares, thus taking us back to the ages of theriomorphism and of the common home of a race still undivided, dwelling in the valley of the Axios or Aliacmon.

Berliner philologische Wochenschrift. 1913.

Aug. 2. O. Viedebantt, *Quaestiones Epiphaniae metrologicae et criticae* (Tittel). Throws some new light on ancient weights and measures. J. Paulson, *Index Lucretianus* (Kraemer). Trustworthy. H. Kiepert et Ch. Huelsen, *Formae urbis Romae Antiquae* (Graffunder). In the new edition one 'Hauptkarte' and four 'Nebenkarten' have been added.

Aug. 9. A. Maidhof, *Zur Begriffsbestimmung der Koine besonders auf Grund des Attizisten Moiris* (Schwyzer). A. Ritzefeld, *Procli Diadochi Lycii Institutio physica*, ed. A. R. (Tittel). With German translation, Latin preface and notes, and an index of the more important words. E. Diehl, *Inscriptiones Latinae* (Riewald). 39 pp. + 50 'Tafeln' (small folio) of photographs of inscriptions in chronological order from the *lapis Romuli* onward. A. Philippson, *Topographische Karte des westlichen Kleinasiens*. Lief. 2 and 3. (H. v. Gaertringen). Much praised.

Aug. 16. E. Diehl, *Supplementum Sophocleum*, ed. E. D. (Bucherer). One of Lietzmann's *Kleine Texte*. Contains the *Ἰχνευραὶ* and other fragments (all that have been discovered since Nauck). (1) C. Clementi, *Pervigilium Veneris*, ed. by C. C. (2) *Pervigilium Veneris*, Oxford Plain Text (Hosius). J. L. Strachan-Davidson, *Problems of the Roman Criminal Law* (Beseler). An admirable introduction to the subject. A. Struck, *Zur Landeskunde von Griechenland* (Gerland). The author had unusual knowledge of the country. E. Bourciez, *Éléments de linguistique romane* (Niedermann). The sketch of Vulgar Latin highly praised.

Aug. 23. C. Pascal, *Le credenze d'oltretomba nelle opere letterarie dell' antichità classica* (Gruppe). Th. Meyer-Steineg, *Chirurgische Instrumente des Altertums* (Scho-nack). Highly praised. Forms a valuable supplement to J. S. Milne's 'Surgical instruments in Greek and Roman times.' O. Schrader, *Die Anschauungen V. Hehns von der Herkunft unserer Kulturpflanzen und Haustiere im Lichte neuerer Forschung* (Keller). Corrects Hehn in many ways.—This number includes a communication from W. Aly as to a *Thesaurus Dialecti Ionicae*. He has nearly ready for use the MS of a complete Index to Herodotus. This will be placed in the Library of the University of Freiburg i. Br., where it may be consulted. He proposes to add to this gradually a record of the vocabulary of other Ionic writings (including the Ionic elements in tragedy and in Attic prose of the fifth century) and ultimately to publish.

Aug. 30. H. Gomperz [son of Th. Gomperz], *Sophistik und Rhetorik* (W. Nestle). N. disagrees for the most part with G.'s conclusions. W. M. Fl. Petrie, *The formation of the alphabet* (Larfeld). Unfavourable.

Sept. 6. Max C. P. Schmidt, *Die Entstehung der antiken Wasseruhr*. Mit 12 Tafeln (Tittel). A useful collection of material. I. van Wageningen, *Auli Persi Flacci satirae*, ed. atque prolegomenis, interpretatione Belgica, commentario instruxit I. v. W. (Hosius). Favourable. J. Wackernagel, *Über einige antike Anredeformen* (Wahrmann). On the vocatives *θεός, deus, ἀνερ, populus*, etc.

Sept. 13. Haupt-Vahlen, *Catulli Tibulli Propertii carmina*. Ed. VII. a Rud. Helmio edita (Magnus). Vahlen left the book ready for the press. W. Havers, *Untersuchungen zur Kasus-syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen* (Hermann). One of the series edited by Brugmann and Thumb. A study of what the author calls the 'Dativus sympatheticus' (e.g. *ἀνθρώποις ἰσθαι νόσους*) in many idg. languages.

Sept. 20. J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, Pt. 5 (Gruppe). P. Persson, *Beiträge zur indogermanischen Wortforschung* (Ehrlich). 'Learned, penetrating and stimulating.' Part 1, *Wörterklärungen*, pp. 1-549. Part 2, *Zur Frage nach den sogenannten Wurzel-determinativen*, pp. 553-913. For the study of semantics see the 'Sachregister' under *Bedeutungswechsel*, pp. 968-990. J. Wright, *Comparative Grammar of the Greek Language* (Hermann). 'On the whole successful in putting together the results of recent investigation.'

Sept. 27. H. Blümner, *Karte von Griechenland zur Zeit des Pausanias sowie in der*

Gegenwart (Schenkl). Supplements the edition of Pausanias by Bl. and Hitzig. M. Pohlenz, *De Ovidi carminibus amatoris* (Th. Birt). P. discusses at length the chronology of Ovid's works down to A.D. 2. [The discussion is continued Nov. 22.]

Oct 4. R. C. Kukula, *C. Plini libri epistularum etc.*, rec. R. C. K. (Baehrens). This, the second, edition marks an advance, but the treatment of the Letters is better than that of the Panegyricus. G. Cardinali, *Studi Graccani* (Bardt). A full statement as to the sources etc. of the history of the Gracchi.

Oct. 11. J. Middendorf, *Elegiae in Maecenatem commentario grammatico instructae adiuncta quaestione chronologica* (Helm). The author assigns these poems and the *Consolatio ad Liviam* to the time of Seneca not that of Augustus. H. Dragendorff, *Westdeutschland zur Römerzeit* (Anthes). An excellent summary.

Oct. 18. L. Weniger, *Der Schild des Achilles*. I. Text mit einer verkleinerten Tafel. II. Tafel in wirklicher Grösse (Brueckner). A good attempt to represent the shield. W. Sternkopf, *Cicero Phil.* 3-6 (Ammon). A continuation of Halm's edition in Weidmann's series. Excellent. [W. S. has since published *Phil.* 7-10.] H. v. Fritze, *Die Elektronprägung von Kyzikos*. [Nomisma. VII] (Weil).

Oct. 25. H. Stuart Jones, *Companion to Roman History* (Peter). Praised. A valuable collection of illustrations. *Mélanges P. F. Girard* (Beseler). Forty-eight papers on Roman law by various writers dedicated to Professor Girard.

Nov. 1. K. Hildebrandt, *Platons Gastmahl, neu übertragen und eingeleitet* (Pavlu). The Introduction (of which a summary is given) is original and valuable. O. Apelt, *Platons Dialog Philebos*, übersetzt und erläutert (Pavlu). H. Sjögren, *M. Tullii Ciceronis ad Q. fratrem epistularum libri tres*, rec. H. S. (Klotz). The edition is based on the views set forth in the author's *Commentationes Tullianae* [Cp. *Class. Rev.* xxv, 1911, pp. 149 sqq.]. S. has given us a much better text. Th. Ladewig and others, *Vergil Aen.* I-VI (Tolkiehn). A. Dieterich, *Mutter Erde* (Stengel). Second edition with 'Nachträge,' 14 pp., by R. Wunsch. I. Bloch, *Die Prostitution*, I (Blümner). Classical antiquity fully treated in 378 pp.; good indices. L. Mauceri, *Il castello Eurialo* (Hude). Reconstruction of the fort built by Dionysius in 402 B.C.

Nov. 8. C. Blinkenberg, *La Chronique du Temple Lindien* (Hiller v. Gaertringen). Editio princeps of the inscription (found in 1904) including lists of gifts to Athena Lindia. R. Beer, *Monumenta palaeographica Vindobonensia*, hrsg. von R. B., Lief. 2 (Weinberger). [The first Part is noticed in Year's Work '1912, p. 125.] This part also contains excellent reproductions of MSS. and notes. U. Ph. Boissevain, *Beschreibung der griech. Münzen zu Amsterdam* (Regling). Follows the arrangement of the London and of Macdonald's Glasgow catalogues. W. Crönert contributes an interesting paper 'Zum griech. Thesaurus.'

Nov. 15. D. S. Margoliouth, *The Poetics of Aristotle* (Crönert). Very valuable for the text. Th. Meyer-Steineg, *Darstellungen normaler und krankhaft veränderter Körperteile an antiken Weihgaben*. 4 Tafeln (Schonack). The illustrations show 'Exvotos' from Cos. Valuable for the study of ancient medicine.

Nov. 22. B. Kuster, *De tribus carminibus papyri Parisinae magicæ* (Preisendanz). Useful. I. Nye, *Sentence connection illustrated chiefly from Livy* (Klotz). A careful study. H. F. Soveri, *De ludorum memoria præcipue Tertullianæ capita selecta* (Bitschowsky). A thorough piece of work. M. Schanz, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* II. 2: *Vom Tode des Augustus bis zur Regierung Hadrians* (Helm). The third edition rewritten and enlarged from 425 to 601 pp. Shows remarkably wide knowledge of recent writing and independent judgment. F. Baumgarten, F. Poland, R. Wagner, *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur. Mit 440 Abbildungen im Text, 11 Tafeln, 4 Karten* (Zielinski). The book brings together and interprets the recent work of many specialists (on papyri, excavations, etc.). The third edition, enlarged and brought up to date, of *Die hellenische Kultur* by the same authors is also favourably reviewed.

Classical Weekly (New York). 1913.

Oct. 4. E. Post, *Selected Epigrams of Martial* (W. B. McDaniel). The notes are 'terse, clear, and interesting.'

Nov. 1. Lane Cooper, *Aristotle on the Art of Poetry* (J. R. Wheeler). 'The many illustrations taken from English authors are likely to be valuable to students of the Classics.'

Nov. 15. L. Friedländer, *Roman Life and Manners*. Authorized translation of the 7th ed. Vol. IV., Appendices and Notes. By A. B. Gough (J. C. Rolfe). 'The value of this work is very greatly increased by the addition of this volume which is in itself a useful book of reference.'

Deutsche Literaturzeitung. 1913.

Aug. 16. C. E. Gleye, *Die Moskauer Sammlung mittelgriechischer Sprichwörter* (P. N. Papageorgiu). J. van Leeuwen I. F., *Ilias I-XII* (F. Stürmer). Maintains the unity and beauty of both Iliad and Odyssey.

Aug. 23. O. Apelt, *Platonische Aufsätze* (W. Moog). Pleasing and stimulating. F. Preisigke, *Berichtigungsliste der griechischen Papyrusurkunden aus Ägypten* (G. Plau-mann). E. Engström, *Carmina latina epigraphica* (E. Diehl). A supplement to Buecheler's collection. G. Rotondi, *Leges publicae populi Romani* (J. Friedrich). Wonderfully complete and accurate.

Aug. 30. F. Blass, *Bacchylidis carmina*. Ed. IV. curavit G. Suess (P. Maas). Open to criticism. L. Meister, *Quaestiones Tullianae ad libros qui inscribuntur de oratore pertinentes* (G. Ammon). Pays attention to rhythm as evidence for the text.

Sept. 6. O. Immisch, *Der erste platonische Brief* (C. Ritter). Rightly explains the letter as from the Spartan Dexippus to Dionysius I, when becoming a tyrant. T. Rice Holmes, *Cæsar's Feldzüge in Gallien und Britannien*. Translations by W. Schott and F. Rosenberg (R. Grosse). The translation is excellent. In the books the early influence of Massilia is insufficiently recognized; the Massiliots, not the Phoenicians, were probably the first to sail the North Sea and discover Britain. The numbers of Caesar's troops are usually understated.

Sept. 13. E. Kapp, *Über das Verhältnis der eudemischen zur nikomachischen Ethik des Aristoteles* (P. von der Mühl). Shows that the conception of the Eudemian ethics is earlier. B. Stech, *Senatores Romani qui fuerint inde a Vespasiano usque ad Traiani exitum* (K. Hönn). Carefully compiled, and indicates incidentally the rapid decay of the patrician families.

Sept. 20. H. Th. Peck, *A History of Classical Philology* from the seventh century B.C. to the twentieth century A.D. (B. A. Müller). In spite of many errors a book of importance, connecting its subject in each century with the spirit of the age. A. Müller, *Ästhetischer Kommentar zu den Tragödien der Sophokles*. 2 Aufl. (H. Klammer). A distinct advance on the first edition.

Sept. 27. W. Riepl, *Das Nachrichtenwesen des Altertums* (H. Blümner).

Oct. 4. Fr. Preisigke, *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten* 1, 2. (G. Plau-mann). E. H. Minns, *Scythians and Greeks* (T. Schmidt). An indispensable handbook of South Russian archaeology, the result of indefatigable labour.

Oct. 11. F. Kutsch, *Attische Heilgötter und Heilheroen* (A. Abt). On the basis of inscriptions shows the rise of heroes to gods and of private cult to state-cult.

Oct. 18. W. Schick, *Favorin περὶ παίδων τροφῆς* (J. Ilberg). Traces the diatribe in Gellius xii. 1 to Chrysippus' tract περὶ παίδων ἀγωγῆς, with amplification of the medical aspect. J. T. Allardice and E. A. Junks, *An Index of the Adverbs of Plautus* (G. Landgraf). A useful collection by two pupils of Professor Lindsay.

Oct. 25. P. Poralla, *Prosopographie der Lakædaemonier* (Hiller v. Gaertringen).

Nov. 1. H. Lommel, *Studien über indogermanische Femininbildungen* (A. Debrun-

ner). H. Ehrlich, *Untersuchungen über die Natur der griechischen Betonung* (E. Her-
mann). The book is minutely examined.

Nov. 8. H. Spiess, *Menschenart und Heldentum in Homer's Ilias* (F. Stürmer).
Valuable to teachers. H. Rabe, *Hermogenis opera* ed. H. R. (K. Münschner).

Nov. 15. G. Heinzelmann, *Animismus und Religion* (C. Clemen).

Nov. 22. W. Köhler, *Die Versbrechung bei den griechischen Tragikern* (K. List-
mann).

Nov. 29. E. Kalinka, *Die pseudoxenophontische 'Αθηναίων Πολιτεία* (R. v. Pöhl-
mann). Contains introduction and translation, with the suggestion that the work
was originally a speech delivered at the symposium of an Hetairia. W. M. Lindsay,
S. Pompei Festi De verborum significatu cum Pauli Epitome, ed. W. M. L. (A. E.
Anspach). Cautious, sometimes too cautious.

Dec. 6. J. de Decker, *Juvenalis declamans* (K. v. Morawski). Traces the influence
of rhetorical schooling on J., but exaggerates his ignorance of philosophy. J. L.
Strachan-Davidson, *Problems of the Roman Criminal Law* (L. Wenger).

Hermathena. 1913.

L. C. Purser, *Two recent Translations of the Apollonius of Philostratus*. Reviews
the translations of F. C. Conybeare (Loeb Classical Library, 1912) and J. S. Philli-
more (Oxford, 1912). To a favourable review he adds many corrections and
criticisms on particular passages. M. T. Smiley, *The Quarrel between Callimachus and
Apollonius Rhodius*. Argues for the continuity of verses 105-113 of Call. *Hymn to
Apollo* with the preceding lines, explains verse 106 as a condensation of Anth. Pal. xl.
275, identifies the 'Assyrian river' as Halys or Iris, and discusses the quarrel in the light
of Call. *Hymn to Apollo* 105-113. W. A. Goligher, in a favourable review of G. M.
Calhoun, *Athenian Clubs in Politics and Litigation* (Austin, Texas, 1913), discusses
various problems connected with ostracism. J. I. Beare, *The Phaedrus; Its struc-
ture; the εἶπος theme; Notes*. Discusses the question, 'why did Plato select εἶπος as a
text for a homily on the moral virtues?' He subjoins a number of notes on the
Phaedrus. W. H. Porter, *The Euripidean Rhesus in the Light of recent Criticism*. Dis-
cusses (1) the sources of the plot of the play; (2) its authenticity. J. P. Postgate,
The Latin Verbal in -ibilis. (1) Classifies and illustrates the uses of the suffix;
(2) discusses its origin; (3) considers the meaning of *curabilis* (Juv. 16. 21) and
placabilis (Virg. *Aen.* 7. 764).

Hermes. Vol. 48. Part 4. 1913.

E. Lattes, *Per l'interpretazione del testo Etrusco di Agrum*. B. Keil, *Über Lukians
Phalarideen*. Φάλαρις β' 10-13 are six excerpts from a third speech by Lucian on
Phalaris. Φάλαρις β' and this mutilated speech (γ') are to be regarded as parallel
speeches developing the situation created in Φάλαρις α'. G. Thiele, *Plantusstudien*, I.
Stoffprobleme des *Rudens*. A. Klotz, *Die Epitoma des Livius*. It has been assumed
that a very early Epitome of Livy lies behind the *Periochae*, and authors, e.g. Valerius
Maximus, who use Livy. Klotz argues that all such late works are based on a
collection of rhetorical *Exempla*. Contains a good discussion of the methods of ancient
Epitomators. P. Friedländer, 'Υποθήκαι, deals (1) with the higher criticism of Hesiod
and Theognis; (2) with the evidence for a gnomic work by Democritus entitled ὑποθή-
και. Miscellen. F. Münzer, *Zu dem Nachruf des Tacitus auf Arminius*, and R. Reitzen-
stein, *Übersesehenes*. These notes contain additions or corrections to R.'s article in
vol. XLVIII. p. 268. Von Fleschenberg (1) *Die Einteilung der 'Ιστορία bei Askle-
piades Myrleanos*. (2) *Eine γνώμη in den Metamorphosen des Apuleius*. K. Hubert, *Der
Bau der Ciceronischen Rede pro M. Tullio*. P. Stengel, *Sakrales*.

Journal of Philology. Vol. 33. No. 65. 1913.

A. Platt, *On Apollonius Rhodius*. Critical comments on Mooney's edition of the *Argonautica*. Notes on i. 936 that νῆσος may mean 'peninsula' in Greek poetry; in ii. 368 λευκῆσι δίναις inquires whether the water of the Iris is 'chalky'; on iii. 158 suggests that the picture given follows Aristotle, and is of two mountains in the far east, one to the north the other to the south of the morning, holding up the sky for the sun to pass between: iv. 786 indicates an earlier sketch of the poem in which the course of the Argonauts was different. A. E. Housman, *aios and eios in Latin poetry*. Finding in Greek a general rule that adjectives derived from feminine proper nouns of the first declension end in -aios, and those from masculines of this declension and from words of the second and third declensions end in -eios, proposes that we should read accordingly -aeus or -eus in Latin poetry. On such a point manuscript evidence has little value. I. Bywater, *Latinizations of the Modern Surname*. Illustrates the varieties of the Latinized names of scholars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and points out the undesirability and uncertainty of attempts to restore the supposed originals. W. R. Hardie, *Notes on Manilius* iv. 590 and *Lucretius* v. 1009, 1010. E. G. Hardy, *The Transpadani and the colony of Novum Comum*. Suggests that Caesar in 59 B.C. established a Roman colony there for the protection of the frontier, and that Marcellus in 51 B.C. disregarded this as a protest against the legality of laws passed in Caesar's consulship. Caesar's answer was the *lex Roscia* of 49 B.C. A. S. F. Gow, *Τὸ σῶπρυξ Τεχνοπαιγνίον*. Archaeological evidence shows that the poem is not by Theocritus. J. F. Duff, *Three passages in Cicero's Letters*. H. Jackson, *An oracle in Procopius*.

Mnemosyne. 41. 4.

J. J. Hartman, *Ad Plutarchi moralia annotationes criticae*. Notes on text and general introduction to the *De Iside et Osiride*, de E. Delphico, de Pythiae oraculo and de defectu oraculorum. P. J. Enk, *Vergiliana*, defends the seeming digression *Aen.* i. 441 sqq.: explains origin of fable of mensae paniceae in *Aen.* vii. 107 sqq. as due to ancient play on double meaning of mensa, as table and pancake (libum). A. Kurfess, *Varia*. Notes on text of *Tib.* i. 3. 4; iii. 14. 6 (= iv. 9. 6); iii. 15. 2 (= iv. 9. 2). *Sall.* *Catil.* xxxvii. 5. *Auson.* p. 116. 8. Peifer. (read semota for sine metu). J. J. Hartman, *Ad Herodoti* I. 11. would cut out τὸν ἐμὲ γυμνὴν θησάμενον and ὅθεν περ . . . γυμνὴν as glosses. A. Poutsma, *De Repetitionis genere quodam*. A valuable collection of repetitions of words in Greek and Roman authors. J. W. Beck, *Varia*: on text of *Prop.* ii. 12. 13 sqq. (read si puer es tu alio traice bella tua). *Tacit.* *Ann.* xii. 49., *Tib.* i. 4. 41-44 (read uenturam mittat). J. C. Naber, *Observatiunculae de iure Romano*, Part 2. Further discussion of property processes in early Germanic law. To be continued. J. W. Beck, *De nova Horatii Carmen* iv. 8. *interpretandi via*: the poem is not composed in stanzas but follows rhetorical divisions and grouping of subjects.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, etc. XXXI. 8. 1913.

K. Ziegler, *Menschen- und Weltenwerden*. From a long discussion of Aristophanes' comic anthropogony in Plato's *Symposion*, its relations to Anaximandros and Empedocles, to the story of the making of man and woman in *Genesis*, and to the cosmogonies of Greek myth and of Orphism, Z. deduces an otherwise unknown Orphic Anthropogony, itself derived from Babylon. B. Schmidt, *Der böse Blick und ähnlicher Zauber im neugriechischen Volksglauben*, touches on several points of ancient Greek superstition and folklore—e.g., the gesture σῦκον and A. B. Cook's derivation of συκοφάντης.

XXI. 9. 1913.

A. Gercke, *Themistokles' List*. A sceptical review of the anecdotes about Th., especially his two messages to Xerxes. E. Maass, *Äschylus und Aristophanes*. A study of stories of rejuvenation, with special reference to Aeschylus' Τροφοί and Aristophanes' *Knights*. E. Norden, *Josephus und Tacitus über Jesus Christus und eine messianische Prophetie*. A searching criticism, in answer to Harnack, of the passage about Jesus in Jos. *Arch.* xviii., and of the view that Tac. drew on Jos. for his passages about Jews and Christians. N. thinks that the prophecy in Tac. *Hist.* v. 13 came to him from the Antonius Iulianus whose *de Iudaeis* is mentioned by Minucius Felix. H. Philipp, review of U. Kahrstedt's *Geschichte der Karthager von 218-146* (vol. iii. of O. Meltzer's *G. d. K.*). J. Ilberg, review of M. Wellmann's *A. Cornelius Celsus, eine Quellenuntersuchung*.

XXXI. 10. 1913.

W. W. Jaeger, *Das Ziel des Lebens in der griechischen Ethik von der Sophistik bis Aristoteles*. On the Platonic σκοπός, its antecedents, and its relations to the Aristotelian τέλος. H. Blümner, review of L. Weniger's *Der Schild des Achilles* (a discussion of the questions involved, with a plate showing a tentative reconstruction of the shield).

Philologus. LXXII. Heft 2. 1913.

W. F. Otto, *Die Luperci und die Feier der Lupercalien*. Contests the view put forward by Deubner and adopted by Wissowa, that *luperci* = 'those who keep off wolves.' The older interpretation (= simply 'wolves') is correct. Latin parallels for the form are *noverca*, etc. The Lupercalia examined and explained as a ceremony of lustration. E. V. Druffel, *Papyrologisches*. (1) Heidelberg Papyrus duplicates of Pap. Grenf. I. 11. (2) Explanation of passage in Pap. Tor. 1. H. Rubenbauer, *Der Bau des trochäischen Tetrameters in der neueren Komödie*. Gives full statistics. L. Gurlitt, *Plautinische Studien*. The 'double entente' in certain love-scenes of Plautus (cf. *asta* = *hasta* = *phallus*, etc.). F. Görres, *Die Religionspolitik des Kaisers Licinius*. (1) Licinius did not take part in the persecutions 302-305 A.D. (2) Licinius and the second persecution. W. A. Baehrens, *Propertiana*. Defends, inter alia, IV. 3. 34 *suos*, IV. 11. 37-40 et . . . *quique*, I. 8. 25 *Atraciiis*. Suggests transpositions. J. Brummer, *Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der sogenannten Donat-Vita des Vergil*. Discusses the Lives in Monacensis 15514, Sanblasianus 86, and in Gudianus fol. No. 70, besides the Life as preserved by the main tradition. S. Brassloff, *Beiträge zum Juristenlatein*. 'Quando' in causal sense, etc. A. Zimmermann, *Randglossen*. (1) *πλευρά*—*costa* = 'wife.' (2) *Tecusa* = 'mother.' (3) *Pellex* = *πάλλαξ* = *Παλλάς*? A. Laudien, *Zu Ilias A 50 f.* A modern parallel. J. Miller, *Nochmals die 16 Epode des Horaz*. Disputes the view of Kukula (*Römische Säkularpoesie*). G. A. Gerhard, *Zur Priesterliste des ptolemäischen Urkundenprotokolls*. A correction in the demotic, which confirms the Greek.

Revue des Études grecques. XXVI. No. 117.

H. Jeanmaire, *The Lacedaemonian Cryptia*. Rejects the modern view that this was a mere preparation for military life, and shows that far from being an anomaly, it is bound up with the Spartan system. By the comparative method shows that the Cryptia is the last phase of the Lacedaemonian initiation, that in which the youth is obliged to undertake a 'retreat' prior to the accomplishment of the final rites. A. Plassart, *The Athenian Archers*. An interesting article of over 50 pp. investigating the origin and history of this institution, with numerous illustrations showing the evidence of the vases. Georges Seure, *The Thracian images of Zeus Keraunos*. The author concludes that Zamolxis, etc., are not the real names of the Thracian god. They are only epithets of a deity of whose real name we are ignorant. O. Rayet, *The Greek Islands*. Some notes of personal experience and travel.

XXI. 8. 1913.

on of Aristophanes' *Maximandros* and *Genesis*, and to the otherwise unknown *dt*, *Der böse Blick* al points of ancient . Cook's derivation

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. XLVIII. 4. 1913.

H. Kallenberg, *Ὅτι und ὥς bei Plato als Hilfsmittel zur Bestimmung der Zeitfolge seiner Schriften*. Evidence for order of dialogues from turns of phrase and form to avoid hiatus, as ὥς for more usual ὅτι in cases where a vowel follows. A. Klotz, *Zur Kritik einiger ciceronischer Reden*. Notes on MSS. of *Cum senatui gratias egit*, *Cum populo gratias egit*, and *De domo* in particular to establish a separate group independent of the Parisinus family. E. Lattes, *A che punto siamo con l'interpretazione dei testi etruschi?* Etruscan not so far from an Aryan speech as supposed, nor its texts a hopeless problem. F. Pfister, *Die lokalhistorie von Sicyon bei Menaichmos, Pausanias und den Chronographen*. There was no 'Cleisthenic redaction' of the chronology of Sicyon. The list of kings in Pausanias is based on local history, probably Menaechmus. The changes in chronographers are due to the fitting of Sicyonian dates into the framework of general Greek history. Notes on Menaechmus' works. W. Aly, *Die literarische Ueberlieferung des Prometheus-mythos*. The myth in Hesiod, Aeschylus, Plato, and the mythographers. From Hesiod may be reconstructed an old 'Homeric Hymn,' the ἀνθρωπίνου γένους γοναί, a product of Ionian rationalistic irony not later than the seventh century B.C. H. Mutschmann, *Die Ueberlieferungsgeschichte des Maximus Tyrius*. Rejects Hobein's theory of the text (Teubner 1910) and argues for the Regius as archetype of all groups of MSS. E. Petersen, *Euripides Hypsipyle*. Reconstruction of play and arrangement of fragments. W. Crönert, *Strassburger literarische Papyri I*. On a fragment of an Ionian work (Strass. Pap. Graec. 2340). H. Ehrlich, *Zu altitalischen Sprachdenkmälern*. On Carmen Arvale: esp. that 'seminu' is from 'semen' and not = gods. On the Fucine Bronze. A. Mentz, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der antiken Schrift*. (1) ὁ ὀξύρυνχος χαρακτήρ. The adj. does not mean 'sharp-beaked' but 'of Oxyrhynchus.' The form of writing is a rounded decorated uncial. (2) Greek shorthand follows Roman in time. (3) Notes of Roman numeral signs, and (4) Seneca's collection of shorthand notes. Miszellen. On Pindar fr. 221, Eur. Tro. 532-7. Dittenberger. I. O. 606: *Ciris* v. 414 (on the Hellespont): MSS. of Tacit. *Dialogus*.

Rivista di Filologia e d' Istruzione Classica. Vol. 41. No. 3. 1913.

M. L. de Gubernatis, *Epitaph of Allia Potestas*. Text with commentary and photograph of Latin inscription of 50 lines in irregular hexameters and pentameters. L. Dalmasso, *Formation of words in Palladius* (continued). On Adjectives in -alis, -arius, -atus, -icius, -inus and -inus, -torius (-sorius), etc. Verbs (a) derived from Nouns, (b) from Adjectives, (c) Inchoatives. Adverbs. Composition: (a) in Nouns, (b) in Adjectives, (c) Verbs. Palladius's vocabulary falls into three chief groups: 1. Technical words; 2. ecclesiastical ones; 3. so-called 'vulgarisms.' R. Sabbadini, *The letter of Donatus to L. Munatius*. Criticism on Blumner's text in *Vitae Vergilianae*. The Letter has a rhythmical character, but quantity is often disregarded. D. Bassi, *Deciphered Herculanum Papyri*. List of the papyri with names and dates of their unrollers and decipherers. P. Rasi, *Hor. Od. I. 27. 19. Defence of laborabas*. E. S., *Obituary Notice of Arturo Graf*.

Vol. 41. No. 4. 1913.

Arnaldo Beltrami, *On the Judaic and particularly the Essenic spirit of the pseudo-Phocylidean Collection*. Would show that the maxims attributed to Phocylides derive much from Jewish and, specially, Essene sources. Achille Beltrami, *A new codex of Seneca's Epistulae Morales*. This MS. in the Biblioteca Queriniana at Brescia (no. B II 6), is fully described and illustrated by 3 photographs. It is assigned to the tenth century, and said to be derived from a better archetype than other MSS. of the *Epistles*. Auguste Mancini, *On the criticism of Asconius*. Lectons and value of the Lucca MS. (no. 1756). An 'indirect copy' of the Matritensis, anticipating a number of modern

corrections. Luigi Malvaggi, *Orthography and Morphology*. Attacks the orthographical theory of Brambach that we should write Latin with the spelling of Quintilian's time and the current one that we should give the earliest spellings attested in each passage by the MSS. The only reasonable course is to restore the spelling of the author's age consistently. In spite of MS. fluctuations in the declension of certain compound adjectives (*inermis exanimis* etc.) the archaising -us forms should be systematically restored in Tacitus. Pier Luigi Ciceri, *The Chapter De Nilo flumine in Isidore's De natura rerum*. On the sources of Isidore's statements.

Wiener Studien. XXXIV. 1. 1913.

H. von Arnim, *Zu den Gedichten des Kerkidas*. Metrical, textual, and exegetical notes on the poems. Hunt and Wilamowitz's identification of the author accepted. L. Radermacher, *Mythica*: I. Στεμφυλοχαίρων Τραπεζοχάρωντι (Alkiphron *Ep.* III, 10) and Χάρων. II. The use of a lock of hair as a love-token. III. Lamps in Heaven representing souls. H. Swoboda, *Die ätolische Komenverfassung*. The κώμη-organization did not continue later than the fourth century. J. Jüthner, *Der spartanische Nachttanz*. Examination of the description in Athen. XIV, 631 B. H. Fischl, *Zur Chronologie der Ödipusdramen des Sophokles*. E. Sofer, *Zu Lykurg u. Aeschines*. On Lycurgus in *Leocratem* § 140. J. Pavlu, *Zu Diogenes Laertius* III, 62. A. Kapellmacher, *Zu Aristoteles' Rhetorik* III, 9. W. Weinberger, *TA EYNOMIOY ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ*. R. Meister, *Das Genus der Substantiva im Sprachgebrauch der LXX*. H. Schenk, *Zum ersten Buche der Selbstbetrachtungen des Marcus Antoninus*. The chronological relations between I and II-XII. R. Beer, *Galenfragmente im codex Pal. Vindobonensis* 16. Restoration of text. A. Rzach, *Sibyllinische Weltalter*. The relation of the *Orac. Sibyl.* to the sources. E. Gollob, *Zu Paulus aus Nicaea*. K. Burkhard, *Auszüge aus Philoponus als Randbemerkungen in einer Nemesiushandschrift*. Extracts from Ph.'s commentary on Aristotle's *περί ψυχῆς*. J. Sadjak, *Zaridae epigrammata in cod. Vindob. phil. Gr.* 341. Text of two epigrams Εἰς τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ τροχοῦ καθήμενον. J. Bick, *Wanderungen griechischer Handschriften*. On the MSS. collected by Busbeck. K. Wessely, *Biene u. Honig*. The relations of the Indoger. and the Ugro-altaic languages. A. Stein, *Griechische Rangtitel in der römischen Kaiserzeit*. The use of the Greek titles at different periods. K. v. Holzinger, *Diokles von Peparethos als Quelle des Fabius Pictor*. E. Kalinka, *Die Herausgabe des Bellum ciuile*. The book was published in Caesar's lifetime. A. Klotz, *Kritisch-exegetische Kleinigkeiten*: 1, *Verg. Ecl.* I. 59 66; 2, *Caes. Bell. Gall.* I. 39, 4; 3, *Caes. Bell. Gall.* VII. 28, 6. A. Engelbrecht, *Zu Ciceros Übersetzung aus dem Platonischen Timaeus*. On Cicero's method in translating. R. C. Kukula, *Quintilian's Interpretation von Horaz's Carm.* I 14. The poem is not an allegory, but a *Propempticum* for Octavian. E. Hauler, *Aus dem Frontopalimpsest*. S. Brasslof, *Die gesetzliche Erbfolge im Recht von Gortyn*. L. M. Hartmann, *Das Latinerbündnis des Sp. Cassius*. K. Beth, *Ueber die Herkunft des orphischen Erikepaios*. Borrowed, as the name shows, from Babylonian cosmogony. A. Bauer, *Der Schluss des Markus-Evangeliums*. The various strata in the text. W. F. Otto, *Römische Sagen*. 1, Those connected with the Family; 2, Anna Perenna. F. Holzer, *Zu den sakralen Inschriften CIL V 4087 und X 797*. E. Bormann, *Zu den neu entdeckten Grabinschriften jüdischer Katakomben von Rom*.

XXXIV. 2. 1913.

J. Mesk, *Lucians Nigrinus und Juvenal* I. Did Lucian know the first satire? R. Mollweide, *Die Entstehung der Cicero-Excerpte des Hadaard u. ihre Bedeutung für die Textkritik*. II. The H-excerpts represent a 'purified' text of the *Corpus Tullianum*. R. Novák, *Kritische Studien zu Seneca Rhetor.* I. W. A. Baehrens, *Zu Florus*, I. Application of the Clausula-laws to the criticism of the text. A. Wilhelm, *Prosopographische Bemerkungen*. Deals with the Hellenic and Hellenistic periods.

Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie. 1913.

Aug. 11. O. Lagercrantz, *Papyrus Graecus Holmiensis*, Recepte für Silber, Steine und Purpur, bearb. von O. L. (H. Blümner). A. P. Wagener, *Popular association of right and left in Roman literature* (H. Blümner). 'A very useful collection of material.' P. Dierschke, *De fide Prisciani in versibus Vergilii Lucani Statii Iuvenalis examinata* (P. Wessner). 'A meritorious work.'

Aug. 18 (double number). Th. Gomperz, *Hellenica. Eine Auswahl philologischer und philosophiegeschichtlicher kleiner Schriften* I, II (W. Nestle). R. Staehlin, *Das Motiv der Mantik im antiken Drama* (W. Nestle). 'Increases our knowledge of many details in the ancient drama.' C. Reinhardt, *De Graecorum theologia* (W. Nestle). 'The method is discreet and therefore convincing.' J. Lesquier, *Papyrus grecs publiés sous la direction de P. Jouguet* II, 2-4. *Papyrus de Magdola*. Sec. ed. par J. L. (C. Wessely).

Sept. 1. I. Bywater, *Aristoteles Περὶ ποιητικῆς*. A revised text with critical introduction, translation, and commentary by I. B., and *Aristotelis de arte poetica liber*, rec. I. B. (P. Cauer). 'Nothing in the German language of a similar nature can be compared with this great edition of the English scholar.' J. Demianczuk, *Supplementum comicum. Comoediae Graecae fragmenta* coll. J. D. (E. Wüst). G. Seure, *Études sur quelques types curieux du cavalier Thrace* (G. Kazarow). 'A weighty contribution to the history of Thracian religion.'

Sept. 8. R. v. Pöhlmann, *Aus Altertum und Gegenwart*. 2. Aufl. (Fr. Cauer). 'Highly to be recommended.' L. Radermacher, *Sophokles*, erkl. von F. W. Schneidewin und A. Nauck. *Oidipus auf Kolonos*. 9. Aufl. von L. R. (F. Adami). O. Seiffert, *Die Ausgrabungen auf dem unteren Teile des Stadtbirges von Pergamon* (K. Löschhorn).

Sept. 15. J. van Leeuwen, *Homer. Ilias I-XII*. Ed. J. van L. (F. Stürmer). 'Disappointing.' D. S. Margoliouth, *The Poetics of Aristotle*. Translated with a revised text (P. Cauer). 'Valuable material here made accessible for the first time.' Th. Herrle, *Quaestiones rhetoricae ad elocutionem pertinentes* (J. Tolkiehn). Traces the development of rhetoric to the end of the first century B.C. A. Thumb, *Satzrhythmus und Satzmelodie in der altgriechischen Prosa* (P. Habermann). 'Of little value.' W. Bowen, *Tacitus, The Annals*, books I and II, by W. B. (G. Andresen). O. Keller, *Die antike Tierwelt*, II. (Fr. Harder). 'Quite indispensable.'

Sept. 22. O. Crusius and W. Nestle, *Nietzsche's Werke* XIX. *Philologica*. 3. Band. *Unveröffentlichtes zur antiken Religion und Philosophie*, herausg. von O.C. and W. N. (H. Steuding). J. W. White, *The verse of Greek comedy* (E. Wüst). 'Shows many-sided learning.' L. Hahn, *Der Kaisertum* (E. Hohl). 'Full of learning.'

Sept. 29. Fr. Boll, *Griechischer Lieberzauber aus Ägypten auf zwei Bleitafeln des Heidelberger Archäologischen Instituts*; L. Fahz, *Ein neues Stück Zauberpapyrus*; R. Wunsch, *Aus einem griechischen Zauberpapyrus*, and *Antike Fluchtafeln*; E. Fehrle, *Antike Hagelzauber*. All favourably noticed by Fr. Pfister. F. Ziemann, *De epistularum Graecarum formulis sollemnibus quaestiones selectae* (Cl. Peters). 'Admirable collection of material.' M. Schlossarek, *Sprachwissenschaftlich-vergleichende Kasusbetrachtung im Lateinischen und Griechischen* (R. Berndt). 'To be warmly commended.'

Oct. 6. J. C. Vollgraff, *Platonis dialogus qui inscribitur Phaedrus*, rec. J. C. V. (H. Gillischewski). 'Makes a step forward.' Aem. Sehart, *De Menandro Euripidis imitatore* (K. Busche). 'Full of matter.' A. Zimmermann, *Neue kritische Beiträge zu den Posthomerica des Quintus Smyrnaeus* (K. Löschhorn). 'Worthy of consideration.'

Oct. 13. K. J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*. 2. Aufl. I. 1 (M. Gelzer). 'Deserves the highest praise.' P. Klimek, *Kritische Studien zu Xenophons Memorabilien*. II. (K. Löschhorn). 'Worth consideration.' Ph. Fabia, *L'ambassade d'Othon aux Vitelliens* (Nohl). W. A. Baehrens, *Beiträge zum lateinischen Syntax* (F. Gustafsson). J. Marouzeau, *Notes sur la fixation du latin classique* (F. Gustafsson).

Oct.
Berndt
Musei
tulae, q
Groehl
'A fine
Oct
Orphic
Waltzi
Octavi
2. Aufl
No
the batt
opinion
edition
mentar
No
'Very
Thrakie
Mitwir
Aeneis
H. T.
biliter s
tion.'

No
H. v. A
Sul Lu
No
T. Hug
sylloge
edition
J. S.
(N. Be
nelle op
collect

GL
P.
fathers
for -la
start w
even in
festival
Μυρμιδ
νέομαι)
and H
κέροψ
In
(Kretsc

Oct. 20. C. Grünewald, *Die Satzparentese bei den zehn attischen Rednern* (R. Berndt). 'Well arranged.' H. F. Allen, *Five Greek mummy-labels in the Metropolitan Museum, New York* (W. Larfeld). W. Obens, *Qua aelate Socratis et Socraticorum epistulae, quae dicuntur, scriptae sint* (W. Vollbrecht). 'The question is here solved.' H. Groehler, *Über den Ursprung und die Bedeutung des französischen Ortsnamen* (H. Philipp). 'A fine piece of work.'

Oct. 27. J. Dörfler, *Die Orphik in Platons Gorgias* (Fr. Pfister). 'Overrates the Orphic influence.' H. Merguet, *Lexikon zu Vergilius*, Lief. 6-10 (H. Belling). P. Waltzing, *Minucius Felix*, Octavius, rec. P. W. II. and A. Schöne, *Minucius Felix*, Octavius, herausg. von A. S. II. (Boenig). A. Mau, *Pompeji in Leben und Kunst*, 2. Aufl. Anhang (H. Blümner). Gives a bibliography up to date.

Nov. 3. H. R. Hall, *The ancient history of the near East from the earliest times to the battle of Salamis* (A. Wiedemann). 'Seeks a middle standpoint between conflicting opinions.' C. Hude, *Lysiae orationes*, rec. C. H. (W. Vollbrecht). The Oxford edition with short but sufficient critical notes. W. Gebhardi, *Ein ästhetischer Kommentar zu den lyrischen Dichtungen des Horaz*, 3 Aufl. von A. Scheffler (H. Belling).

Nov. 10. E. Bulanda, *Bogen und Pfeil bei den Völkern des Altertums* (H. Blümner). 'Very complete.' M. L. Strack, *Die antiken Münzen Nord-Griechenlands*. II. *Thrakien I. 1. Die Münzen der Thraker und der Städte Abdera, Ainos, Anchialos*, unter Mitwirkung von H. v. Fritze bearb. von M. L. S. (H. Gaebler). E. Diehl, *Vergil Aeneis II. mit dem Commentar des Servius*, herausg. von E. D. (H. Belling). H. T. Karsten, *Commenti Donatiani ad Terenti fabulas scholia genuina et spuria probabiliter separare conatus est* H. T. K. II. (P. Wessner). 'Deserves the fullest recognition.'

Nov. 17. C. Robert, *Sophokles, Die Spürhunde*, übersetzt von C. R. (A. Stamm). H. v. Arnim, *Supplementum Euripideum*, bearb. von H. v. A. (K. Busche). V. Ussani, *Sul Ludus de morte Claudii* (Rabehl). 'U's alterations are no improvement.'

Nov. 24. F. Wendorff, *Die aristokratischen Sprecher der Theognis-Sammlung*, and T. Hudson Williams, *Theognis, the elegies and other elegies included in the Theognidean sylloge*, by T. H. W. (β.). 'The edition of Hudson Williams is the best English edition up to now.' E. Diehl, *Supplementum Sophocleum*, ed. E. D. (A. Stamm). J. S. Phillimore, *Philostratus in honour of Apollonius of Tyana*, transl. by J. S. P. (N. Bees). 'Shows great diligence and learning.' C. Pascal, *Le credenze d'oltretomba nelle opere litterarie dell' antichità classica* (H. Steuding). 'The sources are carefully collected and used.'

LANGUAGE.

Glotta. IV. Band, 4 Heft. 1913.

P. Kretschmer, *Mythical Names*. 'Ἀχιλλεύς belongs to the numerous class of heroic fathers whose sons have compound names, cf. 'Ὀδυσσεύς-Τηλέμαχος, 'Ἀτρεΐς-Ἀγαμέμνων; for -ιλ- cf. ὀργίλος, κωτίλος; the first part is ἄχος, cf. Πενθίλος, Πενθεύς, Ἀχέρων; we start with a hero of the Adonis-Attis type who had the 'sad' fate of an early death; even in the age of Pausanias the women of Elis mourned for Achilles at an annual festival; he ruled in Φθίη 'land of the dead' (φθίμενοι) over the 'people of terror' Μυρμιδόνες, cf. Μορμώ, formido. Nestor was a Chthonian deity who returned (Νόστος, νέομαι) from the 'gate' of Hades; Πύλος was the scene of a fight between Heracles and Hades; Cecrops, another Chthonian, was the god with the serpent's 'tail' κέρκοψ cf. Πέλοψ).

In the *Literatur-bericht* of books on the Greek Language published in 1910 (Kretschmer) we find notices of numerous works dealing with the modern Greek dia-

lects. It is very gratifying to find linguistic students paying so much attention to this indispensable handmaid of the ancient classics; but why do we never find any mention of new books written in the living speech of modern Greece, e.g. the dramas of Nirvanas and Xenopoulos, or the poems of Palamas, works of fascinating interest and great literary merit written in the popular idiom? Among points of interest may be noted the praise given to the dialect studies of R. M. Dawkins (*JHS.* XXX), the reference to the survival of the infinitive in Pontus (as imperative only), Premerstein's discussion of the inscription on the Cleobis and Biton statue at Delphi, and the delightful parallel to the compromise which gave Pheidippides his name (*Clouds*), viz. big compounds like Δημητροσιμοσπυράγγελος which result when the priest, parent, and god-parent fail to agree on a child's name in Cephallenia. Schulze explains Δωριῆς as a short form of δωρίμαχοι, 'spear-fighters,' the name given to them by their bow-using neighbours the Locrians (cf. *Il.* 13. 712); Kretschmer suggests that Δωρίς their original home means 'tree-land,' cf. Δρύοις. The *Bericht* includes a large number of Greek and Latin etymologies that are particularly adventurous and unconvincing. In the sections on *Syntax* one is much struck with the extraordinary amount of work done in Latin, the report on which covers forty pages (for Greek five pages suffice). We note a large number of monographs on the usage of single writers, especially of the post-classical period, e.g. Arnobius, Avitus. Bennett's *Syntax of Early Latin* comes in for much praise, and, if one may judge from the reviewer's description, few classical scholars can afford to miss Frobenius's *Syntax of Ennius* (Tübingen diss.) and Ruckdeschel's two programmes (Munich) on *Archaisms and Vulgarisms in the Language of Horace*.

V. Band, 1, 2 Heft. 1913.

Witte continues his articles on *Homeric forms and metrical influence*; Lambertz concludes his discussion of the *Supernomen in the Roman Empire*. Havers, *On the use of the Dative in the Italic Dialects*. Aly, on Ἀπέθουσα, σημάτων, θυμέλη, Εὐρώπη, Φοίνιξ. Buturas, *On the Irrational nasal in modern Greek*. Baehrens contributes a very interesting miscellany on Latin Syntax; Indicative for Imperative, especially in the well-attested and widespread *nides enim*; *quis* for *quidam*, e.g. *quae a quibus audiri silere nequeo* Greg. Tur.; *omnia*=*omnino* with a defence of Lucr. ii. 456 and Cic. *Att.* iv. 1. 7; *talem* . . . *quod* for which Lucr. ii. 453 supplies a link with archaic Latin; *exx.* of genit. abs. and acc. abs. in late Latin; *idem*=*is*, with which we may compare the constant use of 'the same' for 'it' or 'them' by half-educated writers of formal letters.

Indogermanische Forschungen. XXXII. Band. Anzeiger. 1913.

K. Brugmann, discussing the new edition (1911) of his *Grundriss*, 2 Band, 2 Teil (nouns and adverbs), calls our attention to a radical change in the arrangement of the whole work. Instead of having the Syntax treated as before by Delbrück in separate volumes, Brugmann has himself taken over the syntax of the noun, and in order to bring it into closer connexion with his treatment of noun morphology he has incorporated it in the new volume. The result is practically a new treatise based in part on Delbrück's pioneer work; this is much more than a mere matter of arrangement; it helps one to realize the kinship of syntax and morphology when the two are elucidated side by side in the same volume, a method we have already learned to appreciate in Hirt's admirable *Handbuch der griechischen Laut- und Formenlehre*, of which a new and much enlarged revision has recently appeared. We note in this *Anzeiger* a somewhat belated but detailed review of Thumb's *Griechische Dialekte* (1910), and an obituary of F. Solmsen (obit June 13, 1911), including a valuable account of his contributions to grammatical science. There are also reviews of Gercke-Norden's *Einleitung*, Hoffmann's *Griechische Sprache*, Buck's *Greek Dialects* and H. L. Jones's *Poetic Plural of Greek Tragedy*.

a to this
mention
amas of
interest
interest
XXX),
Premier-
phi, and
(Clouds),
parent,
explains
by their
at Δωπίς
a large
and un-
ordinary
reek five
f single
ennett's
rom the
yntax of
rchaisms

ambertz
the use of
, Φοίνιξ.
interest-
the well-
ve nequeo
v. 1. 7;
exx. of
the con-
letters.

d, 2 Teil
nt of the
separate
order to
s incor-
in part
gement;
two are
arned to
elekre, of
e in this
Dialekte
valuable
views of
lects and